THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVII AUGUST, 1938 No. 218

EDITORIAL

We print this month an account of Dr. Niemoller's sufferings for conscience' sake. Well-wishers to the cause of liberty are often in a dilemma. If they are silent when fellow-Christians abroad are persecuted, they are thought to be callous. If they utter protests, they may make things worse for the persecuted. They may irritate the persecutors, who resent foreign interference, and they may lay the persecuted open to the charge of having stirred up foreign opinion against their country. It may be remembered that Dr. Niemoller's defending counsel a year ago was accused of being " in touch with foreign political and religious circles." Nevertheless, it is impossible to remain silent, and it is, or should be, possible to comment on the affairs of another nation with no vestige of hatred or ill-will. There is occasionally encountered in England a really bitter anti-German feeling, the kind of feeling which would persecute if it had the opportunity. A like feeling on a larger scale about Russia, which has been observable in some quarters for years, seems to be passing away. But hatred is always wrong, and never necessary. You can love your neighbour, and deal faithfully with him. You can even reason severely with him, as St. Paul did with Felix, of righteousness and temperance and judgment to come, in the hope that the Paraclete will convict him in respect of sin, and yet go on loving him. It is even much easier for us in the face of Germany than it was for St. Paul in the face of Felix. St. Paul owed little to Felix. Our world, and especially that part of it which cares for theology, philosophy, scholarship and the arts, owes so much to Germany that, if we are to be faithful to truth, we cannot but love both Germany and Germans. Yet must we not weep when freedom is crucified ?

One matter which shocks the Christian conscience is the treatment of the Jews. Our own mediæval record in the matter

is as bad as can be, but the Middle Ages are long past, and nearly all modern Englishmen contrive to combine a rather awkward, puzzled impression that the Jew is an unusual person, having something about him that is hard for the Englishman to understand, with a genuinely liberal toleration. Elsewhere, it seems quite different. Germans, who in ordinary life are sensible and kind-hearted men, seem to have almost no pity for the Jews. They explain that in their country there were before 1933 too many Jews. They had, it is said, a stranglehold on the life of the nation. They held too many professorships at the Universities, they dominated the press, the theatre and the cinema, and in the two last their influence was often corrupting. Something had to be done about it. A purge was necessary. Some of the Jews were very decent fellows, and one could not but be sorry for them. But if the action were taken on racial lines, as of course it must be, the decent Jews would have to suffer. You cannot make an omelette without breaking eggs. This is the case as put to English enquirers. Very well, let it be supposed that there is some reason in it, that the situation in Germany was in 1933 very much more difficult than our own, that the German Jews were of inferior citizen-value as compared with English Jews. Was there anything in the situation which furnishes the faintest justification for organized cruelty? And, moreover, for the kind of organized cruelty which fastens on points of religion and exploits them without shame or scruple? This seems to us the crowning infamy of the programme. To make an elderly Jewish shopkeeper crawl on his stomach and repeat at every yard (see Feuchtwanger's *The Oppermanns*), "I am a beastly Jew," is animal cruelty. To make him scrub floors and clean closet bowls with the sacred prayer-bands (see the *New Statesman* for April 23, 1938) is the sin against the Holy Ghost.

We have set this in the foreground because one test of the righteousness of any indignation that may be felt is the test of its provenance. Does it arise in an area with which we are not ourselves immediately concerned? Is it genuinely altruistic? This was the thing that gave passion to Sydney Smith's plea for Catholic emancipation. He was naïvely, even grotesquely, incompetent to understand Catholicism.

> "I am as disgusted," he wrote, "with the nonsense of the Roman Catholic religion as you can be: and no man who talks such nonsense shall ever tithe the product of the

earth, nor meddle with the ecclesiastical establishment in any shape; but what have I to do with the speculative nonsense of his theology, when the object is to elect the mayor of a county town, or to appoint the colonel of a marching regiment? Will a man discharge the solemn impertinences of the one office with less zeal, or shrink from the bloody boldness of the other with greater timidity, because the blockhead believes in all the Catholic nonsense of the real presence?"

It is an extreme case, a combination of contemptuous and complacent disbelief in the theological convictions of the oppressed persons and a rich and splendid desire that they should be oppressed no longer. George Eliot has somewhere a description of the young Dissenting Minister of the same period who rather puzzled his simple congregation by his belief that the Papists would hereafter burn everlastingly, but that they ought to be emancipated now.

It need hardly be said that our sympathy for the Jews is theologically more enlightened than that of either Sydney Smith or the young minister for Papists. But let us be sure that it is as sincere. It is much easier for us to-day to be tolerant. Let us also love justice as well as they. The recent death of that devoted veteran Dr. Claude Montefiore calls attention to the attractive and constructive side of modern Judaism. Dr. Montefiore, the Jewish von Hügel, by his Biblical scholarship, his co-operation with Christian scholars, by his work for the excellent Society of Jews and Christians, and by his unfailing charity, was an example of the fine flower of Jewish culture. He was a perpetual reminder of the greatness of the contribution that Jews have in them to make to the sum-total of both grace and truth. And although he was eminently learned and eminently liberal, and approached Christian belief much more nearly than most Jews, he helps to enlist our sympathy for his whole people. Some of them are ignorant and intolerant, and some of them have used financial power in an unscrupulous way, but they are our elder brothers in the religion of the Bible, and it is elementary charity to refrain from vilifying, and much more from compelling them to take a hand in vilifying, the faith of their fathers.

We come back to our original subject, the treatment in Germany of men who, being loyal citizens and patriots, believe that the Gospel is a divine thing which cannot be modified

and expurgated and nationalized at the bidding of that secular power. Two books relating to the subject lie on our table. One, *Cross and Swastika* (Student Christian Movement, 6*s*.), is by Dr. Arthur Frey. Dr. Frey is an economist, now head of the Swiss Evangelical Press Service in Zurich. Dr. Barth contributes an introduction to the book, and it is evident that the author, not himself a trained theologian, thinks of religion and of Christianity in the Barthian way. He is thus more rigid and sharper in antithesis than a Lutheran would be. "The Church," he says, "has always spoken only a human word, and it has never confessed before the world on the basis of the eternal Word." It seems to him that "Christian doctrines," whether as put forward by the Roman Catholic Church in Germany or in "Protestant literature," are useless. On the other hand, something of a dogmatic nature is essential. The numerous Germans who at the beginning were wanting to co-operate in the fight for the Church's freedom, but had no use for a Confession, proved to have little staying power for the fight. "Only a Church which possesses a clear and common Confession really has the strength to confess." "What saved and renewed the Church was nothing else than simple belief in God's Word and simple obedience to that Word."

This is his way of putting it. Others would express it differently. But whatever hesitation may be felt about adopting all his theological emphases, and acquiescing in all his theological omissions, his book will be found very useful. It gives an account of the race-philosophy of National-Socialism, of the "German Christians," and of the Confessional Church.

The other book is indispensable. It is *The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Germany* (Gollancz, 8*s*. 6*d*.), by the Dean of Chichester. It is a masterly book, containing a full historical account of the whole struggle, with abundant documentation, and by a writer who loves and understands Germany and appreciates the strength and influence of Catholicism. The Dean does not pretend to be without bias. "The fact that there have been mistakes on both sides, and that on both sides there is evidence of ideals, does not—in my view—absolve us from trying the spirits. There are false prophets as well as true. Sincerity is admirable; but truth is vital. Even those who find the faith of the Christians remote from their own experience may feel that it is better to side with the oppressed in conscience rather than with the oppressor, and may be glad to be better acquainted with a story that,

beneath the forest of detail, draws its inspiration from the deepest wells of the human spirit."

This is from the Preface, and there are occasional verdicts here and there throughout the book, and an eloquent summary and warning at the end, but for the most part it is objective, an historical record, the like of which we have not had. Everybody must read it.

The question which must be asked is this: Is Niemoller the Stephen of a long and widespread persecution? Are *Mein Kampf* and *The Might of the Twentieth Century* the writing on the wall of Europe, an indication that the same conflict may be expected everywhere before very long? We think that it is. The pressure in our own country will be of a different kind, because the ways of British Governments are different, and because the Church of England on the one hand lacks some of the international sanctions and some of the international odium which the Roman Catholics have, and on the other hand has had long practice in living alongside a secular power. But we think that it will come. There are indeed signs that it is coming already. The Tithe Act does not arise from any particular hostility to the Church. But it does imply an impression that the Church does not matter much. Soon, if the Church behaves as it should, it will be felt to be a nuisance, and then to be positively dangerous. Then steps will be taken to clip its wings.

All this may not happen. When physicists make our flesh creep by talking of the entropy of things, and tell us that the machine is running down, the sun is cooling, and in a million years or so we shall all die of cold, they do not always remind us that it is possible that cosmic rays may repair the wastage. In the same way there is a sense of defeatism in politicians which may make them turn to the Church as a producer of that spiritual power which they know to be wanted. That is why it is important at this crisis, always provided that principle is not betrayed, to be rather less intransigent than Dr. Niemoller. English theology has sometimes drifted through subservience to defeat, but it has sometimes been led by realism to victory. When you take your stand upon the rock, you want to be very sure that it is indeed the very Rock of Ages. This warning also applies to Dr. Headlam's pro-Nazi counsels in *The Times*, and to the "United Christian Front" which Mr. Arnold Lunn commends on another page of this number.

THE STUDY OF MORAL AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY*

I AM going to take the opportunity given by this lecture to lay before you certain thoughts concerning the contribution which the chair to which I have had the honour to be appointed, and the department of learning to which it belongs, may make to the studies of this university. In order to do this I must begin by reminding you of certain well-known facts in the history both of the chair and of the university.

Until the year 1927 the chair was simply of "Pastoral Theology"; in that year its title was changed and it became what it is now, the chair of "Moral and Pastoral Theology." Why was this change made? It was in recognition of a change which had already taken place in the education of the clergy and of the place of the university in that education. There was a time when the university was largely occupied in the education of clergy and when candidates for holy orders expected to receive at the university all the training they were supposed to require before ordination. Its theological departments were therefore designed to cover, under the guidance of the theological professors, the various subjects in which it was necessary that these candidates should be trained in preparation for their ministerial duties, and the chair of pastoral theology was doubtless intended to ensure their receiving a training in *pastoralia* to accompany their studies in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, the Bible, Christian doctrine and the history of the Church.

But by the end of the last century the university was no longer a purely Church of England institution, and Theological Colleges for the post-graduate training of ordinands had become an established element in the Church's economy. These colleges themselves, though founded for the purpose of giving what may be called a professional or vocational training, have always found *pastoralia* a difficult subject to provide for efficiently, since it aims at instruction in a τέχνη which the pupil has little or no opportunity to practise. For this reason some would postpone a great deal of it until the diaconate and make more provision for continued educational supervision at that stage than is now ensured; others are experimenting along different lines, as in the Ordination Training Scheme recently instituted at the Oxford House in Bethnal Green.

However that may be, it is clear that during his university

* Inaugural Lecture delivered in the University of Oxford on June 14, 1938.

career the ordination candidate is at least one, if not two, stages away from the time when his professional training in τεχνικά can most usefully be attempted; and the university has become the place in which he should follow the pursuit of academic studies as a preparation for the vocational training to follow. I have no doubt that this was the consideration which led to the changes in the title of the chair, and in the statute governing it, made in 1927. Up to that date the special reference to instruction in preaching shewed that the statute meant instruction in the duties of the pastoral office to be interpreted as including professional training in τεχνικά; though a distinctly academic element was added in the prescription of liturgical history. In 1927 both of these were deleted; the chair was relieved of all responsibility for the study of liturgics, the words "Moral and" were added to the title, the phrase "duties of the pastoral office" was left vague and undefined, and some new suggestions made by the addition of the words "and in such subjects as Christian Ethics, both social and individual, Ascetic and Mystical Theology, and the Study of the various Types of Christian Experience." Now "moral theology" has long been recognized as a proper subject of intellectual study in a learned society, so that the addition to the title and the removal of the reference to instruction in preaching were clearly intended to indicate that henceforward this chair was to be occupied with academic studies in the field of Christian ethics parallel to those which form the subjects of the other chairs in the university. But at the same time the word "Pastoral" was retained, and suggestions made indicating that a wider range of subjects might be regarded as properly belonging to the province of the chair.

Thus the meaning of the title as a whole cannot be derived simply from an analysis of the words composing it, and the statute suggests rather than defines the range of subjects to be included under it. Doubtless, as so commonly in the university and, indeed, in English life generally, the meaning will in the long run be determined by tradition. The shaping of that tradition will depend primarily upon the nature of the appointments made to it, and already, I submit, there is some evidence indicative of the form it will take. The first appointment made after the change of title was of a scholar already distinguished as a specialist in the field of moral theology proper. But I can make no claim to be a specialist in that field as he was. And yet, in spite of this fact being well known, I have been appointed. I take it therefore to be intended that this chair is to be used to give its holders the opportunity of bringing to theological study in this place whatever contribution

each in turn is qualified to make, it being understood that these contributions will fall within the general limits suggested by the title "Moral and Pastoral Theology," and that they will be appropriate to studies which rightly belong to the work of a university. It would be proper, for example, to include under "Pastoral Theology" a philosophical examination of the grounds of the Christian faith which could be a basis for later professional training in Christian apologetics. And it would be proper to include under "Moral Theology" the general study of Christian ethics as well as what is commonly known as "moral theology" in a narrower sense.

But though the studies to be engaged in here must be such as can rightly have a place in a university, studies which can therefore be described as academic, if they are to be the foundation for the later professional training they must be influenced in their direction by the demands which the practice of their vocation will make upon those who engage in them. The shape of a foundation, and the materials of which it is constructed, must be relevant to the building which is to be erected upon it. Now there was held in this city last July a conference of representatives of various Christian Churches from all over the world, at which among other things a definite effort was made to discover what are the demands which the world of to-day makes upon the Church in the sphere of morals. In the Report of that conference there are certain passages of great significance for our purpose. It is said, for example, that:

> "The Church, as a worshipping community, must relate its acts of repentance and dedication to the economic order in which its members live. . . . The training of the clergy must include preparation for this kind of teaching. . . . (This) work . . . cannot be performed without the co-operation of the laity. Groups of men and women who are responsible for the conduct of industry and the functioning of the economic order must be helped to discover for themselves how the principles which we have tried to enunciate can be worked out in the spheres of life which are in some measure under their control. This opens up a large field for experiment, and calls for fresh developments in many directions, as well as for new types of ministry."
>
> "The Church finds itself to-day in a new relation to the community in which precedent is an insufficient guide. . . . In new circumstances it is challenged to find a new understanding of its duty to the common life."*

* *The Churches Survey their Task* (London, 1937), pp. 124, 201.

To these quotations may be added the following statement by Sir Walter Moberly:

> " We are told that even in the Middle Ages the Church's teaching about usury was ineffective, and Dr. Lindsay suggests that this was ' because one set of men, the clergy, were laying down laws for another set of men instead of teaching these men to lay down laws for themselves.' Neither the Archbishop of Canterbury nor the President of the Free Church Council, nor the assemblies over which they preside are really competent to direct Lord Halifax or Lord Nuffield, the Lord Chief Justice or the Governor of the Bank of England or the Editor of *The Times*, Sir Josiah Stamp or Mr. Ernest Bevin or Sir Walter Citrine how as Christians they ought to conduct affairs. For it is only so far as moral questions are concerned that the Christian Church is directly concerned; but in practice moral and technical questions are commonly intertwined and it is only those who are themselves involved in the situation who can disentangle them. Moreover, even the answers to the moral questions may depend in part on insight into the technical situation. . . . The individual layman is the spearpoint. It is through him as a rule that the Church must act in the affairs of the modern world, if it is to act at all. But he can only be expected to carry this burden if, in future, he can be given help by the Church which is now not given at all. If he is to come to a right decision as to his Christian duty he needs the support of some informed Christian public opinion. To-day this seldom exists in the different spheres of the common life in which decisions are required. The crucial question for the Churches is: How can such help be provided ?"*

It is clear that the demands made upon the Church as a result of this examination of its present situation are demands which cannot wholly be met in the academic sphere. But if they are to be met the academic world will have to play its part, and not least in the department of moral and pastoral theology.

So far as I have been able personally to observe the studies carried on in various institutions of theological education, there is a common tendency to distinguish between the study of what are called " Christian Ethics " on the one hand, and " Moral Theology " on the other. To a certain extent this distinction represents a difference in types of churchmanship.

* *The Contemporary Review* (London, May, 1938), p. 557.

In some places the very phrase "moral theology" suggests a priestcraft from which true Christianity was emancipated by the Reformation and "Christian ethics" is the only discipline recognized; in others "moral theology," in the narrower sense, is regarded as especially valuable precisely because it secures to modern clergy their inheritance of catholic professional training; and the study of "Christian ethics" is regarded with a certain amount of suspicion as tending to weaken loyalty to the Church's moral standards and requirements. Where both are recognized, there is often little attempt made to co-ordinate the studies; a course of ethics of a somewhat narrowly academic character is supplemented by some equally narrowly practical instruction in the art of spiritual guidance.

Where there is this divorce between the two disciplines, both suffer. Only too often what is called "moral theology" has ceased to be a live attempt to solve the problems of the present time, and has a certain unreality when considered in relation to the actual work of a Christian minister to-day. The manuals provided for his guidance are often based on some Roman Catholic work which is said to have been adapted where necessary for Anglican usage. But the underlying assumption is that the priest is being trained for the practice of hearing confessions, giving or withholding absolution, and offering spiritual advice to penitents; the situation envisaged is one in which the priest is ministering to a community of persons who are willing to seek his help in this way, and to submit the conduct of their affairs to his authoritative guidance. Now I do not for a moment wish to belittle the value of the practice of sacramental confession, or the necessity of proper training for this ministry; but I submit that there is an element of unreality about the outlook which sees in this the chief task to which the priest of to-day is called in the field of moral guidance. With what proportion of his parishioners does the average priest of to-day make contact through this particular ministry at all? Where, as is so common, a man is struggling single-handed to minister to a population of ten or twelve thousand souls, with what proportion of them could he hope to deal in this way if they were all to demand it? Not only does this training do little to help the priest in a large and important part of his work, but the fact that it is only relevant to his dealings with a certain minority of the faithful tends to restrict attention to those problems of the individual spiritual life which are apt to be important for that portion of his flock, and to leave out those problems which the Report of the Oxford Conference of last July had in mind in the sentence already quoted: "The Church finds itself to-day in a new relation

to the community in which precedent is an insufficient guide."

If " moral theology " is too often limited to the development of a certain type of individual piety on the basis of precedent, " Christian ethics " is also too often deficient in another way. This " moral theology " may tend too much to substitute reliance on precedent for the examination of problems as they exist to-day, yet those precedents are derived ultimately from principles formulated as the result of attention to the problems of their time by Christian thinkers who had every claim to respect as genuine moral theologians. But in much of the literature of " Christian ethics " the problem seems to be to discover whether there be any principles at all. Books in which Christian thinkers examine the actual conditions and problems of present-day life in order to find out what it will mean to meet them as a Christian are rare. In medical schools there are many men who have made it their task to study some particular mystery of the body's working or failing to work; parallel attention from the Christian standpoint to problems where (to quote Sir Walter Moberly) " the answers to the moral questions may depend in part on insight into the technical questions " are by no means so common in theological seminaries. I have often thought that if those responsible for the teaching of Christian ethics in different seminaries would specialize on different questions of this type and make it their business to learn from those who are engaged in the world's work how to understand the technical questions, the monographs they might produce on separate problems would be more valuable than a series of books covering the same ground and dealing with the general question, " Why be good ?" which is what the present system tends to provide.

I have said this much because it seems to me that, when faced by such a challenge as that issued by the Conference of last July, the first thing necessary is to reflect upon our present habits and ask where we can find remediable weaknesses and deficiencies. But criticism, including departmental self-criticism, is sterile unless it issues in constructive suggestions for improvement, and I propose to devote the rest of my time to sketching in outline the principles in accordance with which I believe these studies should be pursued.

It may surely be taken as common ground that the foundation of Christian ethics must be found in God's revelation of Himself in and through Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word to whom the written word, the Bible, bears witness. The first question which arises concerns the manner in which that revelation provides guidance for Christians in different ages for the

problems of their own times. It is often said that in the teaching of Christ, recorded in the Gospels, we are not given rules but principles. The implications of this statement are not so often realized, and language is frequently used which suggests that it is a merely verbal distinction—such language, for example, which speaks of "applying principles," as though they could be carried round ready for use like bits of sticking plaster. If we are to build on sure foundations we must begin by examining this matter further.

In the moral sphere these principles with which we are concerned are those universals of which Socrates was in search and concerning whose nature and status there has been continuous discussion in the world of philosophy ever since. From this discussion we learn that it is characteristic of all such universals to be presented to the human mind in and through particular instances of them and, conversely, that it is characteristic of the human mind to be able to recognize them in such presentations and thus to recognize the kinship between different instances of the same universal. But we may not conclude from this that we can always know the universals themselves directly and completely. It may be that in some comparatively simple cases something approaching this may be possible. Through inspection of a particular triangle, for example, we may be able to pass to a knowledge, originally mediated but now direct, of the nature of triangularity in which we can see clearly that it is capable of particularization in three and only three types. But we cannot argue to the whole of our experience from what is possible in a simple case in the abstract field of mathematics. When we are thinking about such universals as goodness and evil, virtues and vices, duties and obligations, we cannot claim to know all their possible modes of manifestation in particulars, especially in a world in whose constitution time is an important factor, so that "new occasions teach new duties." Now it is one of the peculiarities in the relation of a universal to its particulars that the latter may differ from one another in their mode of being instances of the former. In the case of the triangles, the isosceles is like the scalene and the equilateral in being triangular; but it is also unlike them in being the kind of triangle it is. Particulars are not mass-produced copies of a single design, numerically distinct but otherwise similar; it is of the essence of their being to be dissimilar as well as similar in their relation to their common universal. If this be so, then different acts may exemplify goodness in different ways, and we must always be prepared to find it turning up in unexpected, unfamiliar and at first sight possibly very odd forms.

This is what makes so unsatisfactory the language about being given principles to apply to cases. It implies that we can carry about in our minds as clear and comprehensive a grasp of the types of particularization possible to each principle as we have in the case of triangularity. But this is not so. We should not ask, then, of God's self-revelation in history that it should give us principles to apply to cases. What shall we ask then? I suggest that we should expect it to make us the kind of people who are capable of recognizing in different situations the principles involved, and I will ask your patience as I try to develop what this will mean.

It seems clear, in the first place, from St. Mark xiii. 11 and parallels, that this mode of dependence on divine revelation was what our Lord Himself intended for His followers. He was speaking of how they should behave when arrested and put on trial for their devotion to Him. It would be of no use for them to lie awake at night trying to compose in advance speeches in reply to indictments they had not heard. They must trust to being able at the moment of crisis to see what response the situation required of them, and the ability to do this would be the work of the Holy Spirit in them. Our Lord happened to be talking about this particular matter of arrest and accusation, but the principle involved is obviously of wider import. The Christian is to be a man who is able to deal rightly with emergencies and unforeseen circumstances because by the guidance of the Spirit he will be able to see in each situation what response it requires of him.

It seems equally clear that in intending this for His followers our Lord was intending that they should share in and continue the mode of life which was His as incarnate on earth. That may be summed up as seeking, finding and doing the Father's will in the Father's world by the guidance and strength of the Spirit. Through the gift of the Spirit they were to be incorporated into membership of His earthly body, to be adopted to share in His sonship, so that henceforward they were to be new creatures, born again to live a new life of eternal quality, in which they shared His relationship both to the Father above and to the Father's world around. For them life was to be seeking, finding and doing the Father's will in the Father's world with the companionship of the Son in the guidance and strength of the Spirit.

The practical problem now arises, if this be the mode of life to which the Christian is called, by what kind of response on his part is the divine vocation to be actualized? It is a life in which he is involved in two relationships, his relationship to God and his relationship to God's world in

which he lives as God's agent. Each must be considered in turn.

In his relation to God the Christian has to help him God's revelation of Himself in history, witnessed to by the written word of the Bible and the records of the history of the Church, and also the inspiration or illumination of the mind that comes through personal intercourse in prayer and sacrament. The core of the former is to be found in the Gospel records of the human life of Christ, and at the centre of the Christian's life must be the continued meditation on and pondering over these. But it is important that they should be meditated on and pondered over as what they really are, the records of His human life on earth. This means that we must study His words and deeds as relevant to the particular situations He had to meet in Palestine some two thousand years ago. It is a study which will require the use of the imagination, but of the imagination rigorously controlled by the discipline of historical scholarship; and its aim must always be to put ourselves back into the scene of the events of which we read, and not to attempt to lift their central figure out of His context and suppose that He would inevitably say and do the same things in response to situations other than those in which He actually said and did them.

How does this help? I can, perhaps, best answer this question by an illustration. We all know how association with other human beings enables us in some measure to know their minds, so that on reading a book, looking in a shop window, or watching a play, we may think to ourselves or remark to our companion, "So-and-so would like this if he were here," or, "So-and-so would not like this at all." It is after this fashion that I believe we are meant to learn to know the mind of Christ, and the study of His responses to the situations of His earthly life is both positively one of the chief means by which this is achieved, and also negatively the chief check upon any tendency to hypostatize our own inclinations and then obey them as the voice of God. But this study of the Gospels must not be divorced from the personal approach through prayer and sacrament, or from that honest attempt to be understanding and solving the problems of today, of which I must speak shortly. The Church which can claim the fulfilment of Christ's promise that the Spirit shall lead it into all truth is the Church which is keeping its knowledge of the mind of Christ objective by study of the Gospels, which is keeping it vital by the personal approach through prayer and sacrament, and which is keeping it fertile through examination of the circumstances of its own time. Each member of the Church

will do his best to provide for all these elements, though, doubtless, the emphasis will vary according to vocation. Care for all three is the inner secret of that way of life whereby the Christian is to be the man who can see what God wants done in strange and unforeseen circumstances.

If the Gospels are to be studied in the way I have described, a way which, to use a fashionable word of the moment, might be called " existentially," it is clear that the same method of approach must be used in the study of all subsequent writings on Christian ethics and moral theology. We cannot insist on treating the sayings of Christ as responses to particular situations and as embodying principles to be discovered by studying them in that connection, and then invest the *dicta* of members of His Church with a timeless validity to which the conditions of their time and the particular situation they had in mind are irrelevant. Their writings cannot be ignored; if we would know the mind of Christ we must study what He has said and done in and through His Spirit-guided body, the Church, as well as what He said and did in that period of His incarnation to which the Gospels bear witness. It is true, of course, that in this later stage the revelation of His mind is subject to distortion through the errors of the human minds by which it is transmitted. We must always be testing the judgments of Christian moralists by reference to the normative record of the Gospels, asking whether we can recognize them as fresh instances of the principles embodied there. But it would be absurd to think that in the passage of nearly twenty centuries in which the Church has been attempting in each age to solve the problems of mankind from the point of view of the mind of Christ, no lessons have been learned which are worth handing on as the fruits of that experience to future generations. To require of each generation that it should cut itself off from its predecessors and start again (if I may use the phrase) from scratch, with nothing but the Bible to help it, is the opposite error to that which would find in precedent a sufficient guide to the problems of the day. In every time and place the Church should face the present problems with the aid of its heritage of experience. If it is to do this it must apply to those problems minds trained in the " existential " study both of its own past history and of Holy Scripture.

This leads on, naturally, to consideration of the second of the two relations in which we have thought of the Christian as standing: his relation to the world in which he is called to live as God's agent. Insight into the moral issues of any situation requires, in the first place, a clear understanding of what the situation itself is, and this may involve what are

described in the Conference Report as "technical" questions. I take it that this phrase is used to mean questions the answer to which is to be found in some field of specialized knowledge, as when a man's obligations depend, for example, on his legal position, or on the medical diagnosis of some physical condition, or on the probable consequences in the economic sphere of some financial operation, or on what are the accepted customs and conventions of some trade or industry. Here an important point to remember is that in the New Testament teaching about the work of the Holy Spirit, whereas evil spirits are represented as taking possession of men in such a way as to set on one side their own reason and self-control, the Holy Spirit does not set these aside, but quickens them, and raises them to their full power. The Christian, then, will not expect his study of the Bible and of the history of Christian thought, or his personal life of prayer, to enable him to dispense with the aid of lawyers, doctors, economists, tradesmen and industrialists in his attempts to discover what has been and is the will of God for man. His task is to inspect each situation with a view to perceiving the moral issues involved in it; his aim is to recognize fresh instances of principles known to him as embodied in the words and deeds of Christ. In the performance of this task, in the pursuit of this aim, he will not expect the guidance of the Holy Spirit to be a substitute for the evidence he needs to seek from those who are qualified to give information in their different fields, or to excuse him from patiently, and it may be laboriously, learning what they have to teach. The same Spirit is the source of whatever is good in the activities of those whose lives and circumstances he seeks to understand, of whatever is true in the accounts they give of them, and of his own ability to understand what they say, and to recognize the underlying unity of moral principle in different situations. In all these different endeavours he will expect the Spirit to guide by quickening and raising to their highest power men's own abilities, and thus the condition of receiving the guidance will be willingness to exercise those abilities to the full.

It follows from this that the study of moral theology cannot profitably be pursued in isolation and divorced from studies not commonly regarded as theological at all. This will be true, not only with reference to the study of the problems of today but also with reference to the study of the moral theology of the past. For the object of this study is the recognition of the moral principles involved in the deliverances of Christian thinkers of other ages, and we have seen that this is only possible if those deliverances are taken as concerned with the

situations which their authors had to face. Here the work of historians, both ecclesiastical and secular, will be of special importance to the moral theologian, for he can only do his own work on the basis of a historical reconstruction of the circumstances in which those deliverances were made.

We have now reached a point at which we can see to what the Church as a whole is called in its vocation to give moral guidance to mankind, and I shall shortly have to bring this lecture to a close by narrowing down the enquiry to consider what contribution to this work can be expected of a university in the education of its ministers. But before we pass to this there is one further point on which I have already touched to which some further attention must be given. I refer to the fact that, important as is the training of the clergy to hear the confessions of the faithful, they have to be prepared for a ministry in which this can only be a small part of their work of moral guidance. In a book published twenty-six years ago, Dr. Greig, the late Bishop of Guildford, who was then Archdeacon of Worcester, spoke of the need of the Church to free itself from a view of the relation between clergy and laity which may have been useful once but is a hindrance now. He wrote as follows:

> " When the civilization of the Roman Empire and its culture were practically destroyed by barbarians, the Church no longer had to commend the faith to and win the adherence of cultivated and thinking men, but of untaught, uncultured hordes. She had to change her tone and methods. With all these tribes and races still in their infancy to win, teach and train, she was almost forced to have an answer for every question and an exact doctrine to cover every point. Have we yet realized the reaction of these backward races on the Church ?"*

Whether or no Dr. Greig is right in tracing it back to this source, there does certainly exist the opinion that it is the duty of the parson to solve his people's problems for them, and that he is to be trained for this task. But how is he to perform it if they will not bring them to him for solution, and if only an infinitesimal proportion of them could if they would ? I wish to suggest that if the analysis of the method of divine guidance, as revealed to us in His Word, which I have put before you in this lecture is sound, then this way of conceiving the relation of clergy to laity is wrong and that education based upon it would be misdirected. Our Lord's ambition for His followers was that they should become men and women

* J. H. Greig: *The Church and Nonconformity* (London, 1912), p. 231.

capable of seeing in each circumstance of life how God would have it used. It is as impossible to anticipate what circumstances will arise and to solve their problems in advance as it is to prepare beforehand a speech which is to reply to an indictment of which the contents are unknown. There may, indeed there often will, be circumstances where immediate action is not required, and where time may be used in seeking advice, and here the clergy should be able to be useful advisers; but for the most part, since the particular problems to be encountered cannot be foreseen and solved in advance, the important thing is to ensure, so far as is possible, that those who have to deal with them in their own lives are the kind of people who can do so successfully. Here moral theology and pastoral theology are seen to go hand in hand, for we have seen that the training through which the Christian may hope to become that kind of person is one in which study of the Bible is linked with faithful perseverance in prayer, and to develop these habits in the people entrusted to his care is among the chief of the priest's pastoral responsibilities. But the point which I am trying to make is this, that while he must do his best to prepare himself to be able to give the right advice where it is sought from him, the priest's main aim should be to develop in every member of his flock the capacity to solve his problems for himself. "It has to be recognized," writes Mr. Garrard in his recent book *Duty and the Will of God*, "that God may make his will known, not to a few selected persons only, to be accepted by the rest on the prophet's authority, but directly to every man through his own conscience."* I submit that if the outlook of the candidate for Holy Orders is inspired by this vision of the whole Church militant as a company of Spirit-guided men and women, his conception of the nature and purpose of his own training in moral theology will be influenced for good.

We come, then, finally, to the question of what contribution to this training can usefully and properly be made by his university education, and whether the situation of the Church to-day as revealed in the Report of last summer's Conference requires any radical revision of what has hitherto been the regular curriculum.

The first consideration to be borne in mind is that the work to be done must be in character academic. Men are not here to be trained in the preaching of sermons or the visiting of the sick, but to be following such academic studies as will be a useful preparation for all their ministry. This means that there must be provided for the student some definite exercise

* Garrard: *Duty and the Will of God* (Oxford, 1938), p. 65.

for the intellect which will require of him mental ability and industry comparable to those required in other departments of learning, and which (not to put too fine a point upon it) can be tested by examination. Hitherto, as a glance at the Examination Statutes will shew, this need has been met by requiring the study of classic works on Christian ethics and moral theology, and I see no reason for any departure from this very natural procedure. What the Report of the Conference does seem to me to demand is a careful examination of the attitude to be adopted towards these works when studying them, and if the argument of such brief examination as I have been able to give in this lecture be sound, then the result will be to require of the student not less but more work of a kind properly called academic. His aim will be to share in the living mind of the Church of to-day as it has been formed by the experience of the past, and this means that no mere knowledge of the contents of the writings he is studying, taken by themselves, will be sufficient. Such knowledge must be illuminated by an understanding of their significance as relevant to the circumstances of their time, and this will require the supplementing of the study of the texts by historical study, and (as I have put it earlier) the use of the imagination rigorously controlled by historical scholarship. We need have no fear that the inclusion of moral and pastoral theology in the university curriculum will admit a discipline in which the academic standards are less exacting than those which prevail in other departments of learning.

But we have seen that the purpose of this study is to enable us to discover the mode in which the underlying moral principles are embodied in the circumstances of our own time, and that for the fulfilment of this purpose it is necessary also to study these circumstances in which there are often involved technical questions of law, economics, methods of industrial production and the like. It is clear that in many of these directions there is room for study which may properly be called academic, in the sense that it requires the use of the mind to observe and collate the facts and to reflect upon them with a view to understanding their significance. I have already said that one of the needs of the time is the prosecution of such studies by Christian thinkers with a view to elucidating the moral issues involved in different fields of human activity. Without the establishment of a kind of ecclesiastical Nuffield College it is difficult to see how such studies could be woven into the fabric of university education, at any rate in the ordinary curriculum for the Arts degree. But I see no reason why a candidate for some further degree should not take for the subject of his

thesis the examination of some particular field of human activity from this point of view, and I should much like to see this done. Even though the main bulk of the work performed could not, by any stretch of the imagination, be called theological, yet if it were done by a student who had prepared himself for it by such study of the Christian moral theology of the past as I have already described, and who made it his aim, in the light of that knowledge, to elucidate the moral issues involved in the subject of his study, I should myself regard his work as falling within the field of moral theology.

LEONARD HODGSON.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH*

And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in prayers (Acts ii. 42).

ON the three great festivals of the Christian Year our thoughts are directed to three different aspects of the faith. At Christmas we naturally think of the doctrine of the Atonement; we ask ourselves what we mean by our belief that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, glorifying human nature by shewing that it can be made a vehicle for the divine. At Easter our thoughts naturally dwell on the Atonement, on the significance of the redeeming death of Christ and of His resurrection from the dead. Today the subject which should be in our minds is the doctrine of the Church. We are reminded of the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended on the first Christians to teach them that the work of Our Lord did not end on the day of His Ascension, and to reveal to them the true meaning of His words: " It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you."

We should therefore think of Whit-Sunday as the birthday of the Christian Church. Some have, indeed, denied that Our Lord looked forward to the organization of a visible society of believers, united by a common experience and by sacramental bonds, but such a view implies that the Fourth Gospel misrepresents His teaching, and that the first chapter of the Acts

* An address delivered in the Chapel of University College, Oxford, on Whit-Sunday (June 5), 1938, by G. H. Stevenson, Fellow and Senior Tutor.

is misleading. The early Church believed that the last words uttered by Christ on earth were: "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem and in all Judæa and in Samaria and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." Our Lord taught His disciples that His work on earth would find its completion in the coming of the Holy Spirit to inspire a body of men in their task of converting the world.

It may, of course, be argued that such passages as those which I have quoted do not prove more than that Our Lord intended, by the gift of the Holy Spirit, to enable individuals to follow in His footsteps, and by their teaching and example to lead others to do the same. According to this view it is wrong to associate closely the doctrine of the Holy Spirit with the doctrine of the Church, and to hold that it is in a visible society of believers that the Holy Spirit normally operates. This attitude, which makes an appeal to British individualism, is familiar enough in Anglo-Saxon countries, but is little known elsewhere. How often is it said or implied that Church-membership is only a hindrance to the highest kinds of Christianity, and that religion is a personal relation between God and the individual.

If we read the narrative of the events which occurred on the first Day of Pentecost as we find it in the New Testament, we cannot avoid the conclusion that this view, whatever may be said for it on general grounds, was not held by the Apostles. We are told that something happened which was mysterious and supernatural. "There came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and they spake with tongues." These words, however they may be interpreted, describe a type of experience which has often recurred in the history of the Church, and of which we have recently been reminded by the commemoration of the work of John Wesley. Many men have been first attracted to the faith, not by reasoning, but by some sudden mystical experience. Psychologists may try to explain these phenomena, but they cannot explain them away, and the mockers who said, "These men are full of new wine," have often been answered.

It is important to note in what way the Apostles reacted to these strange events. In what can be called a doctrinal sermon, St. Peter brought them into connection with the teaching of the Hebrew prophets, and shewed that the coming of the Holy Ghost was the culmination of the work of Christ, which they had foretold. When his discourse was finished he invited his hearers to repent and be baptized. It is clear that in his opinion the experience which they had undergone could

not bear good fruit in their lives unless it were completed by an intellectual appreciation of the meaning of the life and work of Christ, by moral reform, and by membership of a visible society, consisting of those who had received the sacrament of Baptism. The first converts to Christianity were brought somewhat suddenly back to ordinary life after the thrilling moment of their conversion. "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers."

These words seem to me to shew with admirable clearness that those who were responsible for the guidance of the infant Church were well aware that an emotional experience cannot produce lasting effects, and may even be dangerous, unless those who have known it are prepared to submit to instruction, to bring it into relation with their ordinary thoughts, and to take part in the corporate life of an organized society. In one sentence there are mentioned three activities which the Church has ever since regarded as fundamental features of her life—doctrine, fellowship, and worship. The Church has always done her work best when the equal importance of these activities has been most fully recognized. If undue stress has been laid by her leaders and adherents on one or other of them, she has exposed herself to quite legitimate criticism. It is possible to over-emphasize the importance of doctrine, of orthodoxy of belief, and to forget that the meaning which individuals attach to the creeds and the form in which they express their convictions is bound to be affected by their character, their education, and their experience. Again, it is only too possible to lay excessive stress on the idea of fellowship, and to seek to gain adherents by minimizing the claims of the intellect and of worship. Finally, those who are convinced that worship is of the very essence of religion, are apt to forget that it may degenerate into a kind of spiritual dissipation unless it rests on firm convictions and inspires in the worshipper a sense of fellowship with those who share his attitude to life.

Everyone who reads the book of Acts must be impressed by the quiet confidence and efficiency with which the Apostles, these "unlearned and ignorant men," set about their task of guiding their first converts, and of organizing them into a society with its own rules and principles. It seems to me justifiable to assume that they were helped in their work by remembering words of Christ which are not recorded in the Gospels as we have them. Christ had promised that the Holy Spirit would "bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." When we attempt to reconstruct the teaching of Our Lord we should not confine our reading

to the Gospel narrative, but should bear in mind that much can be learned by studying the words and actions of the Apostles and of those who, like St. Paul, owed what they knew of Christ to the teaching of men who had been His companions during His life on earth.

If one accepts this view, it is legitimate to believe that the organization of a visible Church, the notes of which are doctrine, fellowship and worship, was in accordance with the mind of Christ. It seemed to the Apostles a matter of course that those who had received the Holy Spirit should be admitted to the Church by the sacrament of Baptism, and that they should join with their fellow-converts in the "breaking of bread." The corporate life of the Church meant everything to the early Christians. "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." But the men to whom St. Paul's epistles were addressed were not content with fellowship; they realized the importance of doctrine and of worship. His most severe critic cannot accuse him of being the champion of a vague and unintellectual emotionalism. How important a part was played by public worship in the life of the early Church is shewn not only by the New Testament but by Pliny's account of the life of the Christians of Bithynia in the reign of Trajan.

What I have said about the events of the first Day of Pentecost is not of merely historical interest, but is very relevant to the situation which we have to face to-day. Our own problems are not so simple as those which confronted the first converts to Christianity. In this country at least the Church does not stand face to face with a world which is frankly pagan. The society in which we live is permeated with Christian ideas, so that it is almost possible to say that good Christians can be found outside the Church. But although the Church is seldom regarded with open hostility, few recognize her claims to loyal support, and the mass of the so-called Christian population does little to shew its respect for organized religion by attending the services of the Church, by assisting her activities with personal or financial help, or by taking an intelligent interest in the writings of her theologians. One constantly encounters in the reviews articles in criticism of organized religion composed by writers to whom it never seems to have occurred that the defects of which they are so conscious could perhaps be remedied if persons like themselves were prepared to offer their services to those who administer the affairs of the Church instead of criticising them from outside.

There have been periods in the history of the Church when too much stress was laid on one or other of the features which

ought to characterize her life-doctrine, fellowship, and worship, but at the present time her responsible leaders are well aware of the importance of all the three. It would, indeed, be a tragedy if she were to lose her influence just because of her success in inspiring society with some Christian ideas. This success has not gone very far, and I think that it is the obvious duty of those who, like ourselves, have been brought up in a definitely Christian tradition, and who have been educated in institutions where our work is consecrated by religious observances to ask ourselves whether those who officially represent organized religion in the world outside our schools and colleges have not a claim on our time and our support. The Church is calling out for the help of the educated laity, and still more for men of intelligence and personality who are prepared to enter her ministry. Some of the features of Church-life which such men find uncongenial have arisen mainly because men like themselves have been content to criticize instead of identifying themselves with the life of the Church. Our loyalty to the Church ought to be like our loyalty to our school or college. If these fall short of our highest ideals, we do not criticize them to a world which is only too glad to listen to our criticisms, but set ourselves the task of remedying the defects of which we are conscious.

I am perhaps speaking to some whose undergraduate days will in a few weeks be over. May I appeal to you not to regard religious observances as merely part of the routine of school or college, which may be left behind when your formal education comes to an end. May I ask you to let your imagination be fired by the thought of the historic Church which began its life on the day which we are commemorating, and which all down the centuries has stood for values and ideals which have preserved Western civilization from barbarism.

I have throughout this address allowed myself to speak of the Church in the singular, though we are all only too well aware that the sublime vision of "one fold and one Shepherd" is still very far from being realized. I do not wish to minimize the disastrous effects of the differences which exist among Christians and of the lack of external unity. At the same time I think that we should ask ourselves whether Our Lord contemplated a totalitarian Church, the members of which would hold identical opinions on all subjects. This seems to me to be inconsistent with many of His own words: "I am the door; by me if any man enter in he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." "In my Father's house are many mansions." Christ wished His followers to go out into the world and to enrich the life of the Church by their experience.

We ought not therefore to be alienated from the Church because on controversial questions her leaders do not always speak with one voice. We all know that our friendship with individuals is not impaired by difference of opinion on quite important subjects. So let us try to think of our fellow-Christians as of men animated by the same spirit as ourselves, and possessing, so to speak, the same background. "Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of Christ. There is one body and one spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism." Something like this point of view is familiar to the fellow-members of an Oxford college. Let us consider whether we cannot adopt it in our relations with our fellow-Christians.

G. H. Stevenson.

ANAPHORA AND EPICLESIS

It was an act of self-devotion to the Divine service on the part of Father Frere when he chose as the subject of the last big book which he could hope to write the problem of the Epiclesis in the Anaphora, and envisaged his work as "an eirenical study."* For it is a matter of immediate and practical importance that clergy and laity should learn to think out clearly and accurately the answer to the problem, What exactly is it that is done in the eucharistic action? And it is necessary to approach the matter in an eirenical spirit, not yielding to the temptation to view the issue in terms of the controversy between the "Words-theory" and the "Spirit-theory" of the Consecration, but trying to find the truth which lies behind the two theories. For us Anglicans the problem has been posed in an acute form by the Prayer Book of 1927-28. Father Frere's hope, expressed in the closing words of his book, was that in the future the "prejudices, ignorances and other misfortunes" which arose over the Canon of 1927-28 may be avoided. Those of us who take a less favourable view than he did of that Canon have none the less to be grateful to him for all that he has done in this book to clear up the issue.

He shows clearly to what evils a one-sided emphasis on the "Words-theory" could lead in the Western Church, with the concentration of attention on the moment of consecration, and

* *The Anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer: An Eirenical Study in Liturgical History.* By Walter Howard Frere, C.R., D.D., sometime Bishop of Truro. Published for the Church Historical Society by S.P.C.K., London, viii+212 pp. 1938. Price 8s. 6d.

the loss of the sense of the meaning of the action as a whole. "The Mass-priest became dominant. Now, so long as he had a serving-boy, he could dispense with deacon and other ministers: he could supersede the congregation also. With the disappearance of the sense of sacrifice there disappeared not only the layman's communion, but also the sense of his lay-priesthood. The ideal layman was the boy who would serve the priest's Mass" (p. 180). He shows further how the Anglican revision of 1552 "fastened upon the English Church (when subsequently it faced up to the situation) an extreme and even exaggerated acceptance of the scholastic view of consecration in its most exclusive form—a form, in fact, which Rome itself, as things are, has relinquished or even repudiated in its dealings with the Eastern Uniat Churches" (p. 201).

On the other hand, the survey in this book of the early patristic evidence cannot help showing that the "Spirit-theory" is not really primitive. The development of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity into a formulated theological form, and that of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Anaphora, are closely parallel: and the Epiclesis has established itself by the end of the fourth century. But prior to this time the evidence for it is, to say the least, weak. And here the question whether the words in Hippolytus' Anaphora, "send thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of thy holy Church," stood in Hippolytus' original text, is one of very considerable importance: for it is the question whether the first definite Epiclesis is to be dated at the end of the second century or towards the end of the fourth. Father Frere would like to think the words are genuine; he mentions, but he nowhere attempts to refute, the contrary argument as stated by Dom Gregory Dix in his edition of the text of Hippolytus. Again, on p. 69, we are told how in A.D. 348 St. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit as effecting the change of the elements: "The bread of the eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Spirit is no longer ordinary bread, but the Body of Christ," and "Then, after we have sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns [the *Sanctus*] we call on the gracious God to send forth the Holy Spirit upon the gifts, that He may make the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine the Blood of Christ. For that which the Holy Spirit touches is sanctified and is changed" (*Catechetical Lectures*, xxi. (iii.) § 3; xxiii. (v.) § 7). But is it safe to assume, as Father Frere assumes on p. 69, that St. Cyril had an Anaphora similar in type to the Liturgies of St. Basil or St. James, and "passed here in silence over the commemoration of the redemptive work of Christ . . . and over the Institution . . . and over the Anamnesis itself"? It might be that

St. Cyril's Invocation immediately followed the *Sanctus*, as in the Egyptian papyrus quoted on pp. 83-84. Serapion (quoted p. 77—date somewhere about A.D. 359) has an Invocation of the Logos after the Recital of the Institution. Towards the end of the fourth century the evidence for the Invocation of the Holy Spirit at this point becomes explicit (p. 82).

Clearly, if we are to reach an answer to the problem of the Epiclesis, which has been posed afresh for us Anglicans by the Canon of 1927-28, it is necessary to go deeper into the rationale of the eucharistic action as it is given in the early rites, and to examine what the meaning of "the consecration" is in relation to the rest of the eucharistic action. The central point of the tentative suggestions which this article seeks to make lies in the words "heaven" and "earth." For the crux of the eucharistic action lies in the interaction in it of heaven and earth, of the One Sacrifice of Christ and the act of offering made by us men. The eucharistic action is not a mere human (earthly) commemoration of Christ's Sacrifice, but rather a re-présent-ation (not répresentation), a "making-newly-present" of the One Sacrifice.

The Greek for this is ἀνάμνησις. It is inadmissible to treat the Christian act of ἀνάμνησις as a "memorial sacrifice" like the Jewish *azkarah*: for those sacrifices were separate acts of sacrifice made by men, and the whole argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews forbids us to equate the Christian bishop or priest with the Jewish priest, since all the sacrifices of the Old Covenant are "fulfilled" in the Sacrifice of the Messiah. I assume, therefore, that the only right exegesis of ἀνάμνησις* is that the Hebrew mind always thinks of "remembering," not as a subjective act of remembrance (wrongly applied to the Eucharist in *English Hymnal* No. 300), but as an objective "bringing back" of something from the past into the present, as in Numbers v. 15, 1 Kings xvii. 18; so that in the eucharistic act of ἀνάμνησις the Passion and Resurrection of Christ come back in living power out of the past into the *here* and *now*. Thus "Do this in remembrance of Me" means, not "Do this to remember Me," nor yet "Offer the memorial-sacrifice which I have appointed," but "Do this act in which My Sacrifice becomes a present reality."

How, then, do the human and earthly act of offering and the Divine and heavenly Sacrifice of Christ interact in the eucharistic act of ἀνάμνησις? Let us take this as our clue, that the action moves at once on the two planes of "earth" and "heaven," and that πνεῦμα means "heavenly substance," its Johannine synonyms being "heavenly," "eternal," "true,"

* See *The Parish Communion*, pp. 9-10, 120-121.

as opposed to " of the earth," " of the flesh " (John iii. 6, iv. 24, vi. 32, 47-50, 55, xvi. 13, etc.).

The action of the Offertory clearly takes place " on earth," for it is we who offer the bread and wine, and they symbolize the substance of our lives, our joys and sorrows, our family life, social life, business life, Church life, etc. But with *Sursum corda* and *Habemus ad Dominum* the action passes to heaven, where the Lord is, seated at the right hand of the Father. Hence there was a certain " inevitability " in the interpolation of the *Sanctus* into the eucharistic prayer at this point, for the Church is " in heaven," worshipping with angels and archangels. Hippolytus, having no *Sanctus*, continues with a *Berakhah* after the Hebrew model; a thanksgiving to God for His mighty acts in creation and redemption, culminating in the Recital of the Institution: and here, as the action is taking place " in heaven," and the earthly celebrant is reproducing our Lord's action, using His things, bread and wine, and His words, it is the Lord's Sacrifice that is being re-présented: the only word to describe this is ἀνάμνησις. Serapion, having the duality of earth and heaven in mind, speaks of the earthly elements as the ὁμοίωμα of the Body and Blood. So the ἀνάμνησις is made: " earth " and " heaven " are one: the act done on earth really takes place " in heaven."

But there is also the earthly oblation which we men have made: and at this point the chief liturgies of East and West all say, " we offer to Thee the bread and the cup," τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν, *de tuis donis ac datis*. The Roman Canon explicitly asks that this our oblation may be accepted by God as He accepted the offerings of Abel, Abraham and Melchizedek (referring, of course, to *our* offering: for it would be impossible to ask God to accept the One Sacrifice of His Son *as* He accepted those of the Old Testament saints), and then that by the hand of the Angel (Christ, the Angel of mighty counsel) our offering may be carried (may *ascend*) to the heavenly altar, that from there, through the act of communion, " all heavenly benediction and grace " may *descend* on those who here partake of the Body and Blood, and so, when they go out into the world, they may carry the Holy Spirit with them in their daily life. Similarly " we beseech Thee to accept this *our* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, that by the merits and death of . . . Christ we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins ": and again, " here we offer and present . . . ourselves, our souls and bodies " . . . that through communion we " may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction."

(In one sense the prayer for the acceptance of man's offering, τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν, is a making explicit of what has been done

already in the act of consecration, since it is *our* bread and wine (representing the substance of our lives) that has become the matter of the Sacrament, and thereby the human oblation has been taken up into the Divine. Things which in the heavenly reality are simultaneous have to be expressed successively in human language.)

And here, surely, we have the essential idea of the Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit. It is that through the act of communion, πνεῦμα or heavenly substance may descend anew to earth, that man on earth may be at-oned with God who is in heaven. In the Epiclesis in the liturgies, the Holy Spirit is invoked "on us and on these Thy gifts"; and He is invoked not merely to consecrate and change the elements, but also that the communicants may receive the fruits of communion. In the Byzantine rites the enumeration of these is expanded into an Intercession for the whole Church. For all gifts of grace in the Church are fruits of Communion.

This idea, however, seems to be crossed in those liturgies by a somewhat different idea—namely, that the consecration is effected by the operation of the Holy Spirit. And this theological truth would seem to involve the danger of a subtle degradation of the conception of the eucharistic action. Hitherto we have been thinking of an *ascent* of the Church into the heavenly place to share in the heavenly worship and return thence filled with heavenly benediction and grace, so that the eucharistic action takes place ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (Ephes. ii. 6); and in this connection it is clear that the act of ἀνάμνησις is effected through πνεῦμα, heavenly substance. The degradation will consist in a conception of the eucharistic action as taking place throughout "on earth." Later, in the West, it will become common for men to think of a *descent* of our Lord to the altar at the consecration, and this will make possible the Calvinistic crudity that "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven and not here." But is not something of the same earth-bound notion creeping in when some of the liturgies* use the verb "*send down* (κατάπεμψον) Thy Holy Spirit," implying that the action is thought of as taking place "on earth"? One must immediately add, however, that in the Byzantine rite this notion is contradicted by the whole atmosphere and tenor of the liturgy, which must appear to every worshipper as the enactment of a heavenly mystery.

But how is it with the Canon of 1927-28? I would suggest that we have here the real reason why that Canon is felt by so

* Apost. Const. and St. Chrysostom. St. Basil and St. James avoid using this verb.

many of us to be unsatisfactory. In spite of the *Sursum Corda* and the *Sanctus*, the impression given by this form of Canon is that the action is taking place " on earth," and the earthly celebrant is making a human act of commemoration of God's redemptive work: so the Recital of the Institution is made to appear in this context more as a human act of remembrance than as a true act of *ἀνάμνησις*. Then, at last, the Holy Spirit is invoked to consecrate the elements in order that we may receive the Divine gift in Communion. Even the 1662 Prayer of Consecration, with its awkwardly worded petition " that we receiving . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood," is preferable: for those words do at least bring in the idea of " heaven," and do something to preserve the idea that the action takes place " in the heavenlies."

The 1927-28 Canon seems to be based, not on an understanding of the meaning of the eucharistic action, but on a liturgiological theory that the proper mode of consecration is by the Invocation of the Holy Spirit. Because of this lack of understanding it fails to achieve that " inevitability " which is the mark of rightness in liturgical as in other art; and the ordinary person feels that it is somehow wrong. It has other faults: it puts on the brakes and comes to a dead stop at the words " procured unto us," so that the next sentence has to start again. Also its summary of the fruits of communion, " that we may be strengthened and refreshed both in body and soul," is miserably and pitifully unworthy when compared with St. Basil or St. James or any of the ancient models.

But behind these faults of composition and phrasing there lies the more serious fault that the rationale of the eucharistic action has not been fully thought out. The Recital of the Institution is made to appear as a narrative, and not as an act of *ἀνάμνησις*. But it is a right instinct to desire to have the bell rung at the words of Institution, because it is then that the Sacrifice of Christ is " made-present." And before we can hope for a satisfactory revision there will be need of a deeper understanding on the part of clergy and people of what it is that we do in the eucharistic action.

GABRIEL HEBERT, S.S.M.

CHRISTIANITY AND WAR

I SHOULD like to begin by emphasizing that I am not going to give you a complete system concerning the question whether the Christian shall go to war or not. My opinion is not a settled one, but that of a man who tries, like you, to hear the word of God through the gospel. To avoid any misconception, let me frankly state that I do not mean that the will of God is—as revealed in the gospel—to be carried out literally, but to consider the life which we have through and with Jesus Christ, as the living Christ, who is the Son of God; and therefore to consider the words which He speaks and which are spoken about Him—but to get behind the mere words to the living Christ Himself, who is the Word.

The trouble of the daily life of a Christian is, that he has a "treasure in earthen vessels" (2 Cor. vi. 7). This treasure is in the eyes of the world a very strange one: "as deceivers, as unknown, as dying, as chastened, as sorrowful, as poor, as having nothing"! (2 Cor. vi. 8 *ff.*). Our perfectness, we may say, "is in Heaven"; in the eyes of God we are "true, well known, there we live, are not killed, always rejoicing, making many rich and possessing all things." That is to say, our life is hid with Christ in God (Col. iii. 3).

And, further, our own life, which is the life of a disciple of Christ, has always two sides: (1) Christ Himself makes us children of God, but children who have sinned and are still sinners, who live in the "flesh" and yet, in spite of the "flesh," have the "spirit" of God. "For we walk by faith and not by sight"—"that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us" (2 Cor. v. 7, and iv. 7).

The fundamental question underlying all others which the Christian has to meet in his daily life is how to reconcile this heavenly citizenship with the demands made upon him by the affairs of this world. Jesus says in St. John: "I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from evil" (John xvii. 15). We have been left in this world, a world in which disaster, war, evil of every kind flourish on every side. The problem then is, How are we to adjust ourselves to this situation?

I do not think that this question is as simple as many would have us believe; they would say that in this world there is evil, one of the most disastrous manifestations of which is war and everything that belongs to it, such as armaments.

As children of God we have to fight against this state of affairs with all our heart and soul and, above all, to take no part in it.

This point of view regards war as something evil in itself, as something quite divorced from life and from human nature. But isn't it deeply connected with our life which we have in the world? And the evil, isn't it rooted in the human nature which is our own, that of every man as well as of every Christian?

But we shall not touch the problem at all if we fail to ask to which sphere of life war belongs. In our modern life it is evident that it is the State's affair, and it is equally obvious that there are problems between States which may lead to war. Our question, therefore, must go further: What is the business of the State? And from the standpoint of the Christian the real ethical problem is now the relationship between Christianity and State.

Now, there are some Christians for whom this question does not arise at all. It would not arise, for instance, for the Christian sectarian. He lives an exclusive life, apart from society and State; in his thought the State belongs to a world in which he himself as a Christian no longer has any real part, and he believes he can live the real, perfect life in his own society—namely, the Church. He denies that the State—that is to say, the ordinary life of ordinary people—has anything to do with God, except that God is the ultimate judge of it.

I myself do not think that this view of Christianity is in accordance with the gospel. I am convinced that the every-day life of every man, be he Christian or non-Christian, is a gift of God, that it is God's creation, and just as He has created different men so He has created different nations. When St. Paul says, in Christ "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Jesus Christ," that does not mean that we as Christians cease to be Greeks or Jews or English and Germans; still less does it mean that they cease to be male and female. We are not taken out of the world.

What, then, is our part in this world? We are born—God has created us and gives us our earthly life in the midst of a certain society, as a member of a certain nation. The duties of our life, they may be best summed up by the famous commandment: Thou shalt love God and thou shalt love thy neighbour.

Our life consists in relationship with other people—that is, personal relationships which are governed by a certain social code of politeness, conventionality, things which everybody is supposed to do because they are members of this special society. In brief, then, this code finds its fixed expression in

the civil law of every State, which by its own power compels all its citizens to recognize it. The daily demands and rules of life of every State are nothing more than what in the Old Testament is called the Law, of which the Ten Commandments are a summary. To put it the other way round—If we as Christians say we are supposed to keep the Ten Commandments, we can do nothing else but to keep the rules of our daily life, which demand, in their real sense, that we shall love our neighbours.

To secure the fulfilment of these laws of the social life is therefore the duty and task of every State. Here is the very sphere of every State. The Old Testament calls it the Law. In modern German theology it is usually called the Order, or, as the Greeks used to say, the *nomos*.

When, now, the State's sphere is the law, it lies in the nature of the law that it has its value and significance as being directed against the abuse and against evil. And the law, on the other hand, gets its real meaning and power when there is something behind it which makes it respected and acknowledged by everybody—that is to say, the State must have real outward power in order to force everybody to respect it and to carry it out. St. Paul says: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions" (Gal. iii. 19). Since it carries out this task the State has its sanctity from God: "For he is the minister of God to thee for good" (Rom. xiii. 4). It is not a sanctity which is given to the State by the Church; it is a sanctity which it has by its own nature, because mere unaided common sense is able to recognize the ethical command of God (Rom. i. 19-ii. 14).

Certainly it is correct to say that this modern common sense has been influenced by Christianity. It is true that modern man's notion of personal relationship has been widely produced by the Old Testament and Christianity. It is in this emphasis on personal relationship that the people of Israel differ from the surrounding States in the ancient world; but, nevertheless, besides this the Greek, and especially the Stoic, philosophy have discovered that in this sphere lies the true aim of human life which has been so generally recognized since the Reformation. Wherever in State and society to-day, as before, the value of the law is recognized, this fact has nothing to do with the Church and Christianity in her true sense as *communio sanctorum*, the people whose life is life with Christ. The life of a society which knows about the ethical obligation is not life with Christ; but it is a life with God, conscious of the will of God in so far as He wants them to keep the order of society, because it is God's will to secure the

outward life. And by fulfilling this office the State receives its sacredness and sanctity. As far as the society is " under the law " it is under God's will. Or, in other words, they know about God in that He reveals Himself through the order.

As far as this point is concerned there may be read one passage of Lord Curzon's Life (vol. iii., p. 391):

He spoke as one who, " by the accidents of events, had been called upon to spend the whole of his working manhood in the study or the service of Empire and to whom it had come to be a secular religion, embodying the most sacred duty . . ."

And about the Empire is said:

The conviction was a firm belief that the Empire was " a pre-ordained dispensation, intended to be a source of strength and discipline to ourselves and of moral and material blessing to others."

And there is not a knowledge about God in the Christian sense:

" The only thing in which we firmly and finally believe is not in each other, nor in Christ, nor in Christianity, nor religion, nor philosophy, but in the God that is somewhere behind them all " (p. 392).

In our modern world, then, in the wake of the Reformation and Renaissance the recognition of human life as consisting in personal relationship has been widely lost. Humanity has become an ego-centred life, without social consciousness, without emphasis on the real value of society and State, a life which has its value solely for its own sake. We have lost the sense of obligation to the neighbour and to the State, and, more, we have lost the knowledge that the State is something which is sacred.

This means that man and common sense are always in danger of losing this knowledge and that the State, or the people who are in office in the State to carry out the order of the State, very easily forget that they are God's ministers for good for their people.

Here may be the place to ask, What is the life of the Christian in the midst of his society and his State? There are many Christians speaking of a Christian ethic as something different from the natural ethic of an ordinary man. They usually take the Ten Commandments as their precepts and when they try to carry them out they maintain that their moral life is more or less of a higher standard than the life of others. I do not want to say that their meaning is a self-deception. I only say that there are living to-day, and that there have always lived throughout history, many people whose ethical

life has the same standard as that of every Christian, even of the best. All men of to-day who fulfil the daily demands of this life do as much as a Christian can do; for the Christian can do nothing more than what is demanded of him by his everyday duties. For the demand of this order of life is: You shall love your neighbour. To take the Commandments as an ideal of ethics is an abstraction which has no connection with real life. The Ten Commandments are no more than a summary of what the natural life demands.

I do not possess a sufficient knowledge of modern English theological literature to quote examples or to discuss the problem in your own terms. I happened to read F. D. Maurice, and I found that he knows about the importance of these questions. In his chapter "The Church and the Nation"—it is in the 2nd vol. of Everyman's library edition of his *Kingdom of Christ*, p. 171 *ff.*—he says nearly exactly the same, although in different terms.

What is then the difference between the Christian life and the life of an ordinary man?

As outward appearances go they do not differ. It is, as Peter Green in his book, *The Man of God*, puts it, a difference of kind, not of degree. When the Christian's duty is to fulfil the daily demands it is necessary to shew in what way the Christian is concerned with that order.

Let me give an example. I have very often heard the English people use the expression "Be honest." It is possible to take this command as a standard for the English conduct of life or for the order of life. "Be honest"—if one takes it seriously it includes the whole meaning of personal relationship, as, for instance, loyalty, obedience, faithfulness, life in love, and truth. In other words, the very meaning of "Be honest" is this injunction: Give your neighbour what you owe to him as fellow-man; it is, You shall love him. The Christian is in the same sense under this order. The significance of the order in this respect we may call its *social* significance.

For the Christian, now, who lives in relationship with Christ, this order "Be honest" gets another meaning. For the average man, as for every Christian, it is quite possible to fulfil this order. He *is* honest, when he acts in accordance with the demand. He is able to put aside *that* evil against which the law "Be honest" has been erected as a wall.

Now, if the man faces Jesus Christ he discovers that the aw "Be honest" demands more, that it has a very, very deep sense. He suddenly sees that it is the honesty, the love, of Christ Himself which is its real meaning, or, facing Christ, he faces the honesty, the love, of God Himself which is demanded

from him. The demand is: Do give yourself completely to your neighbour, to love him with your whole heart.

In discovering this demand he discovers his own sinfulness; when he thought he had fulfilled the law he had only done so in a superficial way. He discovers the evil which is rooted in the depth of his heart, and he feels that he stands condemned by the deep demand of the order which lies in its nature as given by God. In other words, he feels the judgement, the wrath, of God Himself.

I should like to emphasize that this happens when he is confronted with Christ; that it is Christ's goodness, His love, the very fulfilment of the law which condemns the man who faces Him. The *homo crucifixus*, the *Ecce Homo*, should never be an object of pity, but the greatest accusation and judgement of man.

Compare the experience of St. Peter (Luke v. 8). The man cannot bear the real love of Christ. He hides himself because this love is judgement for him. "When Peter saw it, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." Or compare St. Paul (Rom. vii. 9 *f.*): "When the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." Here God reveals to him the very meaning of the law, of the order; the accusing power of the law—it reveals the man's sin; he finds that his whole life has been bound in sin and that he is condemned to death. This significance of the order, of the law—of which I explained the social sense before—this real meaning of it and its power which reveals the sinfulness and condemns to death I may call its *theological* or its *spiritual* significance. The man now knows that he cannot have life with God by what he himself does; he must agree that his condemnation by the law is just. In theological terms: He cannot get his justification before God because he finds himself far away from God, and if he would try again to live through the law its awful meaning, its accusing power, condemns him more and more; it makes his sinfulness even greater.

Although when all this happens Christ confronts the man, Christ does not withdraw Himself from the condemned; He loves him because His love does not cease. He loves even where nothing is worth loving. Now God's righteousness appears in Christ who demands, but as a righteousness which gives. That means the man cannot do anything that will set him free from his self-centred life. In dealing with Christ he can only take—as a child takes from his father. And this obedience is to take—to open his empty hands and

to allow Christ to love him, as a child which has done something wrong allows his loving father to take his hands. In theological terms: He must trust Christ to love him. In other words, we must have faith.

It is clear that his justification is not by his own righteousness; what he has himself is nothing but sin and death. His new justification is Christ's love—the *justitia aliena*, not his own.

So, on the one hand, in his own eyes, in the eyes of the law, he is a sinner—a *peccator*, but at the same time in Christ he is righteous—a *justus*. He is *simul justus* and *simul peccator*.

It is necessary to add something about the new life of the Christian in order to understand how he lives in society and in the State.

He is a newborn because he has Christ's love, because he has life with Christ. But at the same time he does not cease to be a sinner, because he does not cease to belong to the flesh. But the sin which is discovered by the law has no longer the power to condemn him; in spite of it he has the *prosagagoge*, the access to God (Rom. v. 2); he can say: "Abba, o pater" (Rom. viii. 15). In this consists the true freedom of a Christian; it is not freedom from sin at all, but a freedom from the power of the sin; not a freedom from the law at all, but from the accusing power of the law, of the order. He is not taken out of the world; he still has to do what everybody else has to do; he still has to be honest. But the way in which he does it is different.

Luther compares this new life in Christ with life between a man and woman who are in love, the life in the family, etc. If they really love each other they do not ask What shall I do? What is my duty? they do everything spontaneously—*sua sponte*—without compulsion.

But this new life in Christ is not an unbroken one; we never live the whole time spontaneously; to-day we feel that Christ is near, but to-morrow perhaps we are indifferent, or forgetful. Everybody who knows about real personal relationship will know these subtle distinctions in his heart, how he withdraws his heart from the other in business, in conventionality and coolness instead of giving love. His experience is that he sins again and again. There are moments where he prays, where he goes to Holy Communion, but his heart is far away from Christ; he even may not know it. Or there may be moments, days and weeks, where he cannot pray.

In these moments, when he tries to live by his own power and self-centredness, and when he becomes aware of his failure —the law, the order, is flinging its whole power against him,

against his sin, and condemns him to death if he does not seek refuge in Christ. The law fulfils its mission as *paidagogos eis Christon*, as schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith (Gal. iii. 24).

Thus St. Paul contrasts the two opposing functions of the law. On the one hand it is abolished, it has no longer the right to condemn the man in Christ. But on the other hand, as he says (Rom. iii. 31): "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law."

If anybody knows about the power of sin and evil the man in Christ knows it. And he will lay stress on all institutions which oppose the evil, because he knows that they are God's will (1) against transgressions, to make life in the world secure; (2) the institutions—the order—are God's schoolmasters to ensure the recognition of sin.

The Christian's task then is, in the first place, only to fulfil the outward order in society and State; second, he must emphasize, as F. D. Maurice puts it, that "Till the whole existing economy of things has ceased, so long as there is any evil to be prevented in it, so long as there is flesh in any man which is not subject to the will of God—so long law in the outward character must exist; and he is the least in the kingdom of heaven, he has least spiritual intuition, who shall try to abridge it of its precepts or its terrors" (*ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 193).

It is therefore a divine duty of the Church to prevent the dissolution of the State's order, a process which nowadays seems to have reached its point of culmination.

We must now turn back to the significance of national life—of the order, as we have said before—and to the interrelation of different nations.

As I said before, I do believe that God has created different nations; but that does not mean that I am thinking of nationalities fixed once for all, just as I do not think that God created the world in six days; but of communities which rise, grow and fall, and in their places new ones rise again. It is a life influenced by nature, culture, history—a life which is thoroughly dynamic.

The aspects of it in which we are interested are that these communities exhibit different authorities, by which the outward life is governed and made secure. I do not think, of course, that God has ordained a certain number, but that they have come into existence by the action of the many and different forces of earthly life, partly by force, by social or economic interests, by free will, by love, or even by hatred and jealousy—by all those things peculiar to human nature and to that earth with which the human life is inextricably

bound up. But behind everything is One on whom all depends and by whom all is moved, the great mover—God.

It is, for instance, useless to complain that there are so many different nations with different authorities; history has formed them and they have more or less decided their own manner of life, their own customs, or have been forced to accept the shaping of history. Therefore we only deal with facts.

You must forgive me for having taken so long to reach our problem of war and peace. But I think it is necessary to explore beforehand the theological and sociological grounds on which my view is based.

It is relatively easy to acknowledge the necessity of law and order in the midst of a community, of a State, and the necessity of their outward safeguard, the police. Most of the pacifists agree to this necessity, even with punishment, because it is obvious that this punishment is concerned with evildoers, although they differ as to whether there should be a capital punishment or not. The difficulty arises for them in the case of war, where it seems to be obvious that persons are punished who have done no wrong, such as women and children and even soldiers, who have to shoot each other although they may be friends and brothers.

Let me ask, therefore, what are "reasons of war," although to the pacifist this question seems to be a foolish one.

I have never studied international law and justice in order to say by what means international affairs are or ought to be regulated—and I am not quite sure whether such a thing as international law and justice exists. Out of my own personal outlook and small experience as a member of one nation I should like to point out two preliminary things which seem to me to be important in the life of every nation:

(1) The natural right for the things necessary to its existence; every nation must have enough space wherein to live and food enough to feed her people.

(2) Every nation wants to live in freedom and honour.

Now both things are not acquired and preserved automatically. We live in a world, on an earth which bears "thorns, also, and thistles," and everybody ought to eat his bread by the "sweat of his brow." We can never get rid of our system of economical, social and cultural competition, for we would vanish from the surface of this earth if we tried to do so. As to the second point, every nation wants to live in freedom and honour; it would rather die than live in dependance and dishonour.

Maurice, in regard to the old Jewish commonwealth, says:

"Courage, self-discipline, order, faith, all these moral attributes were connected in them with the conviction that national life is a more precious thing than individual life, and that hundreds of thousands of individuals are cheaply sacrificed for the sake of preserving it . . . and we cannot refuse to believe that the other nations of antiquity were justified in their deep inward conviction that God had not given swords to them in vain" (*ibid.*, vol ii., p. 179).

He says the same of modern history, and he blames the fathers of the early Christian Church for having left all the relations of men, as held together by the bonds of neighbourhood, as distinguished by race and language, unaccounted for (p. 235).

It is rather amazing to see some Christians who emphasize that their Christian life is only possible in a community—how easily they forget that their political life is the life of a political community. They share all things which do belong to the nation, such as the whole culture and civilization, times of disaster, of honour and dishonour, of freedom and dependance, and they also share the good and the evil which works among themselves and are responsible for it, either in that the evil is suffering for them in a spiritual sense, or that they all have to bear the consequences in a very external way.

England is more than the individual Englishman and Germany is more than the single German. One of the English I met said to me once: "I like the Germans, but I dislike Germany." I have heard, of course, better opinions from others and have read worse in books and newspapers. I only take it as an example in order to shew what I mean, that behind the single man is the whole social environment from which he cannot be divorced.

Now suppose in a case of emergency, of danger, or, if freedom and the honour of his people is threatened, suppose that it is provoked by one or two men only—their lives, their fate, their danger is the danger and fate of the people as a whole. And the single member of a nation who enjoys peace, safety and freedom of his nation will and must join the modern means by which life and freedom is to be preserved—he must go to war for his people's sake.

There are many people who would probably agree that a war of defence is a permissible one. This was, for instance, Luther's position against the Turks and in the Peasants' War. But it is extremely difficult for our modern world to make out who is the aggressor and who the defender; for instance, with regard to who was responsible for the outbreak of the Great War, I know a lot of English theological students who do

not question that Germany was guilty, although there are English historians and politicians who emphasize that Germany was not more guilty than other States (compare Trevelyan, *History of England*). In contrast you will find the same variety of opinion among German people concerning France and England.

Lord Asquith was looking for an international law when he spoke of the community of power behind the law which would be able to prevent war. I could not discover on what principles this international law should be based. But I am afraid no international law will have sanctity and will never last unless it is based upon a full appreciation of the true natures of the nations which fall under it.

Russia is an example; she burst into revolution because of her intolerable internal social order. The same revolt against an international law must come if it suppresses the natural life and the freedom of nations under it. And the statesman of such a suppressed nation must regard it as his holy duty to break this law which has lost its validity.

But much more serious is the case of the Christian who, following the Sermon on the Mount, is against war because it is against our Lord's command, Thou shall not kill.

One who is a pacifist for this reason must cut out of his Bibles: (1) The whole Old Testament: the God of the Old Testament is the Lord God of Sabaoth who was Israel's active helper in war. (2) He must cut out John the Baptist: he did not abolish the office of the soldier. (3) He must cut out St. Paul: he acknowledged authority and State; so did St. Peter. St. Paul himself claimed his rights as a Roman citizen and wanted to be treated as such.

But for the true disciple of Christ, so argues the pacifist, the Lord's order alone is to be followed.

I think it will be in vain to quote F. D. Maurice against this opinion, who said we should not be so narrow-minded as to take the command of Christ as a new formal law which superseded the old. The new order, Thou shalt not kill, does not abolish the old one, An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth (the first one is the kernel of the last and it is the inner sense of the old). Maurice calls it (the old command) the righteous principle, and the State is that which teaches each man that there is a Lord, an invisible ruler and judge and governor over him . . . and Christ was not come to destroy but to fulfil the law: an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

The so-called pacifist supposes that he can govern a non-Christian world by a law which is Christ's, not the Christian's, because Christ fulfilled it, not the Christian. We should not

confuse the social significance and the spiritual significance, as I called them: the latter with a meaning so spiritual and so awful—as Maurice says. The mistake of the pacifist, I think, is that he does not take the law seriously; he does not see its awful meaning and what it demands from him, because he deceives himself; he does not take his own sinfulness seriously. If he did he would not believe himself able to make the world peaceful; he could not deceive himself that he could rule a world by this law because he would know that he himself does not fulfil it. He does not believe in the evil nature of the world because he does not believe in his own. If he did he would be humble and knowing about his own sinfulness, confess that his perfection—his *politema*—is in heaven, not in this world. The gospel of Christ seems to be frightfully simple; but if we take it seriously we ought to have the experience of St. Paul, who at first tried to fulfil it and who tells us what happened to him. We ought to have the experience of St. Paul, who found himself condemned by the awful meaning of Christ's command, and he said: " Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended . . . but I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus " (Phil. iii. 13).

I say the pacifist deceives himself because he believes he can establish the kingdom of Christ in this world, to overcome evil by good, as he says—and Christ denied both. Christ did not establish His kingdom on earth and He did not overcome evil by death in the sense as the Christian pacifist believes. The pacifist ideal is one of mere sentimental humanism, which found expression, for instance, in Goethe's Iphigenie, that " pure humanity overcomes evil." Of course I agree that it is possible to succeed in this way on some occasions, and that it is good and necessary to do so; but we should not deceive ourselves into thinking that we can overcome that evil against which Christ's law is directed. Christ knew about an evil which thoroughly hardens the hearts and of which we all are partakers.

Some weeks ago I read a fine little book called *The Greatest Thing in the World.* The author spoke with much power and enthusiasm about the thirteenth chapter of St. Paul's First Corinthians. He called this the *summum bonum.* But it was rather amazing and disappointing—he only spoke of the man, of his moral duty and his moral power. He quite forgot that it is Christ's love which never faileth, not ours. The Christian who really knows about the " awful meaning " of the law—I must repeat it again—knows that his love always faileth.

I am afraid the Christians who pretend to know so much about love as the *summum bonum* know too little about Christ's

love which condemns man's own *summum bonum*. For this Christian Christ has the function of a new law-giver, he takes Christ's command for a rule of life and Christ Himself for a pattern of a perfect life. In doing so he believes himself to have life with God and in following the new order which he thinks to be a new one.

But in spite of this he is still the old man, and more : he has been put unto severest slavery, he tries to fulfil a law which he does not fulfil and which he cannot fulfil; it is impossible to do it because his own love always faileth. He will see it when he sees the deep sense of Christ's command, in feeling Christ's love which never faileth. " But when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death " (Rom. vii. 9 *f.*).

This Christian who always needs Christ's love cannot dare to give the world a new order which cannot be fulfilled. The order of life is the law in its social sense and the Christian has to do in it what everybody else must do. His task is, in preaching the gospel, to reveal the spiritual sense of the order and to shew them that they are sinners and are in need of Christ. " I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin " (Rom. vii. 25).

There are many pacifists to-day who say that the modern war is not a fighting in the old sense, but that it is murder; and you can read many books which regard re-armament, guns and aeroplanes, etc., in themselves as wicked, as incarnations of the evil, and that military training is merely teaching men how to murder.

I think that these ideas are not only unreasonable and superstitious, they are also wicked. The pacifist should consider that since Cain raised his hand against his brother Abel, since the first piece of wood was used to threaten or to kill another man, since the first evil thought came into the heart of a man—since that time the world, God's creation, has not been a blessing but a curse. The things in themselves are not wicked, but the man who uses them. But I maintain that the pacifist's ideas against weapons are wicked.

Maurice says about the Quakers what in some way can be said about the pacifists (pp. 218-9):

The Quakers society has contained self-denying and brave men, who have borne witness for the truth that we are not to resist evil, but when we are smitten on one cheek to turn the other also. Such men must have done good. Everyone who lets the world see that selfishness is not his law, that he

can obey a principle, that the arm of God is more to be trusted than the arm of flesh, will certainly do good. But there is nothing to hinder the Catholic Church from bearing such testimonies, many in all ages have borne them. It is the other kind of Quaker testimony, his negative testimony, which seems to me of no worth at all, except so far as it may obtain some worth from its mixture with the acts I have just spoken of, nay, which in itself is seriously mischievous. There is much in the worst feelings of men, especially in our day, which sympathizes with the Quaker language respecting war and punishments. There is a cowardly shrinking from mere physical suffering, a great disposition to talk about the expensiveness of national honour, because money is a visible, honour an invisible, thing; there is an unreasonable, uncharitable, and superstitious notion that a soldier, so far as his profession is concerned, is of this world, and that a man who dies on the field of battle is necessarily less prepared for his change than one who dies in his bed. All these feelings, which have sadly tended to degrade and impoverish the mind of modern Europe, to cultivate the trade temper, to make armies what they are told they must be, and therefore to make them dangerous by depriving them of any high restraining principle, have been greatly encouraged by the tone which religious men of our day have adopted from the Quakers. What is such language doing for the promotion of permanent and universal peace? It is the greatest hindrance to any high understanding of the words, to any hopeful expectation of the thing. For whoever translates the holy name "Peace" by carnal security or luxurious ease, desecrates it and makes every spiritual application of it unmeaning. Whoever teaches civilians to love their pelf above all things, or military men to believe that they have no vocation but a murderous one, helps to make the one so weak that they must be ready to quail before any physical force, the other so wicked that they must be ready to exert it. And the loss of all national spirit will lead, as it has ever done, not to a golden age of Christian fraternization, but to a military despotism.

The Christian pacifist will argue still further: You cannot overcome evil by evil—as he puts it—but only by good. In his eyes national life, freedom and honour do not count much.

I myself would not resist in order to get or to preserve things for myself; but as a member of a nation would resist and would go to war in order to preserve the freedom, honour and independence of my people. I do not want my people to give up their language, culture, and all that in which is their originality as a German people—and I do not want my people

to starve. It is not because I do not want it, but because, as I believe, it is God's will to preserve order and different national life, and that it is God's will to have in a world of evil weapons against transgressions.

The Christian pacifist will not only, by abolishing or condemning armament, as Maurice says, create chaos, but an authority which has lost its holy obligation as God's minister. He will create a statesman who forgets his duty in becoming a despot or dictator. And what we need is just the contrary, to make the statesman and the soldier believe that they have duties which are given them by God, and therefore they must fulfil them with sane reason and consciousness of the responsibility which they owe Him; that they, as we, must do what we can in order to prevent war. But in spite of all awfulness, of all cruelty and disaster—and I believe with the pacifist that wars in future will be much more terrible than any wars before—in spite of all this I believe it is a holy duty for the Christians to go into war and to kill in order to stand for freedom and independence.

We are in the hands of the living God and we should not forget that; although He is the loving father, it is He also who, as Jeremiah says (chapter 25), sends the cup of fury and causes all nations to drink it and be moved and be mad because of the sword that He will send among them.

This does not mean that God is the cause of evil and disaster, but that He is the mover, the *causa efficiens*, in old philosophical language.

It is a terrible thing to realize what an English friend of mine once said: "Suppose there is a war and every one of us with a gun in his hands and we shall shoot each other." And if war is inevitable I am afraid we must, as crazy as it seems to be. But I do not think that our killing each other is murder; we will remain friends. Our belief is that our life is hid with Christ in the kingdom of heaven.

HEINZ ORTMANN.

(Queen's College, Birmingham.)

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

"OUTSIDE THE CHURCH"

DEAR SIR,

I have just seen a copy of your recent issue, in which Mr. Ashley Sampson credits me by implication with the odd view that "all is in darkness outside the Church," and accuses me of denying "the power of the Holy Spirit to work through individuals." I am sure that you will grant an old contributor to your columns space to deny that he holds views in plain contradiction to Catholic teaching.

I quoted in a recent book two passages which every Catholic would endorse. The first is from Dr. Karl Adam's book, *The Spirit of Catholicism*: "Not merely a Christian life, but a complete and lofty Christian life, a life according to the 'full age of Christ,' a saintly life, is possible—so Catholics believe—even in definitely non-Catholic communions."

The second is from Cardinal Manning: "My experiences among those who are out of the Church confirms all I have written of the doctrines of grace. I have intimately known souls living by faith, hope, and charity, and the sanctifying grace with the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, in humility, absolute purity of life and heart, in constant meditation on Holy Scripture, unceasing prayer, complete self-denial, personal work among the poor; in a word, living lives of visible sanctification, as undoubtedly the work of the Holy Ghost as I have ever seen."

As a pendant to these quotations may I quote a noble passage from one of Cardinal Manning's successors at Westminster? Writing in *The Times* on July 26, 1937, Cardinal Hinsley said: "Between those who believe in Christ as true God and true man and worship Him there should be charity—an effort to draw nearer to Him, and so nearer to one another. This means not only friendly relationship but mutual help in defending the civilization which is founded on the truths enunciated in the Nicæan creed. Sir Henry Lunn rightly insists on this bond between us. Let us be frank. There have been, in the past, misunderstandings and faults of manner on both sides, and of temper or a lack of charity in controversy. These, our failings and differences, the enemies of religion have exploited. But the realization of a common peril is drawing Christians together in practical sympathy."

It is, perhaps, impertinent to mention my own views in such company, but may I add that there is no more urgent need at the moment than for a United Christian Front against that militant atheism which exploits with satanic skill the quarrels which still divide the Christian family. Surely the beliefs which we hold in common are more important than the differences that divide us.

Yours faithfully,
ARNOLD LUNN.

VILLINO SAN REMIGIO,
PALLANZA,
LAGO MAGGIORE,
ITALY,
June 22, 1938.

DR. NIEMOLLER

Why is he in a Concentration Camp?

Dr. Niemoller is the most distinguished of the many victims of Herr Hitler's anti-Christian campaign. From the first he has consistently resisted the measures by which Herr Hitler has tried to bring the German Evangelical Church under the full control of the State. The "Confessional Church" represents that section of the Church which believed in remaining true to the Christian "Confession," and in order to safeguard it found it necessary to set up their own Church administration. As the inspiring leader of the Confessional Church, Dr. Niemoller has achieved world-wide fame.

The rest of the German Evangelical Church, under pressure of the State, is allowing itself to come more and more under the influence of the anti-Christian teaching, the worship of "Race, Soil, and Blood" (and of Hitler himself), which is being actively promoted by the State. Many reject it in their hearts, but have not the courage to speak out and thereby risk their careers and even their personal freedom.

Dr. Niemoller refused to obey some of the numerous highly arbitrary and unjust Decrees by which the State has tried to strangle the life of the Church—*e.g.*, the Decree which forbids the free holding of collections in Church.

He was arrested, however, before the issue of the *most* shattering of these Decrees—*i.e.*, those by which the control of the Church is handed over to official secular authority—the Ministry for Church Affairs—which is free to vest supreme powers over the Church in semi-pagan nominees; such powers include control of Church finance and expenditure, of appointments, and of theological training for the ministry.

From U-Boat to Church

The life-story of Dr. Niemoller easily disposes of any idea that the trouble he has incurred under the Hitler régime is due to any political hostility on Niemoller's part. His is certainly a dramatic career. He is the son of a Westphalian pastor. On leaving school he entered the navy, and during the Great War distinguished himself as a U-boat commander. After the War he decided to go on to the land, and he worked as a labourer on a farm.

At that time his nation and homeland (this is how he expresses it) laid hold of his heart so intensely that he dedicated himself anew to their service. Gradually there grew up in his mind the conviction that he must become a minister of religion.

He went to Munster for his training, but as he had lost all his fortune during the inflation, he earned money for his expenses by hard labour as the head gangman of a group of navvies on the railroad. When the Red Army, after the "Kapp" rising, occupied the region of the Ruhr, he enrolled himself at once as a volunteer and commanded a troop until the danger was over.

His entire life since then has been given to the ordinary work of the Church. For many years he was Secretary of the Westphalian Pro-

vincial Union for Home Mission work. Years before the present conflict he became pastor of the church at Dahlem, Berlin.

As early as 1924 Niemoller gave his vote for the National Socialist Party.

From Pulpit to Prison

He welcomed the advent of Hitler and of the new régime. But he soon found himself obliged to resist the methods whereby the State, from 1933 onwards, tried to incorporate the Church within itself. With unfailing courage he resisted every attempt to impose fetters on the Church and to alter its essential nature and function in accordance with non-religious purposes, every attempt to reduce to silence the Church and its adherents. In the face of all propaganda for pagan myth and in defamation of Christianity, he stood out for the undiluted Word of God and for freedom to testify to it.

On July 1, 1937, he was taken to prison. The German people was officially informed in the Press that "for a long time, in sermons and lectures, he has incited people to rebellion. He has defamed leading members of the State and of the National Socialist Movement. He has circulated untrue assertions about State measures in order to disturb the populace. He has likewise urged resistance against State laws and enactments."

Time and again his trial was put off. For seven whole months no opportunity was given him to justify himself before a German court of justice against these attacks on his honour. On the other hand, during all this time the Press, under the control of the State, was given every opportunity publicly to blacken his name and to take away his honour. At last, in February, 1938, the trial took place before a Special Court in Berlin. After two weeks, during which all publicity was suppressed and admission accorded only to officials and partisans of the State, Niemoller was sentenced to seven months' confinement in a fortress and a fine of 2,000 marks. This verdict exposes once and for all the complete falsity of the attacks publicly made against Niemoller, for, according to Article 20 of the Penal Code, a man can only be confined in a fortress when he has done nothing harmful to the German people and when his action has been solely determined by honourable motives.

The Court declared that the confinement in a fortress, and 500 marks of the fine, had been cancelled by the imprisonment he had already undergone. None the less, Martin Niemoller was taken next day by the Secret State Police to the concentration camp at Sachsenhausen. An abbreviated version of the verdict was given to the German people. Nothing was said as to the imprisonment and part of the fine being cancelled, and all comment was forbidden. The fact that he had been taken to a concentration camp was also suppressed.

It is now common knowledge that it was by Hitler's own intervention that the Court's verdict was disregarded and Niemoller placed in a concentration camp for an indefinite period. Here he is treated as a criminal. The "special privileges" which are talked about have hardly any basis in fact.

He has to endure *completely* solitary confinement, and is allowed to speak to *no one*, not even in the short time allowed for exercise in the courtyard. He wears the ordinary prison garb. Apart from his Bible and hymn-book, the only books to which he has had access are those

of the prison library, intended for the use of uneducated people (many of them criminals). Already he has had to spend months without a pen or a pencil—a great deprivation to a man accustomed to make notes of all he reads, and to give expression to his thoughts. (Once a fortnight he may write to his wife.) One contrasts this treatment with that allowed to Hitler himself when he was imprisoned in a fortress and took the opportunity to write *Mein Kampf*.

The mental and spiritual ordeal and strain of prison-cell existence to a man of Dr. Niemoller's phenomenal energy and activity, accustomed to a crowded life in the mainstream of human affairs, is something difficult to over-estimate.

Nor can we forget that concentration camps are under the control of the Secret Police, and therefore entirely outside the jurisdiction of the law. Deaths in them are frequent and are usually notified as "by suicide," or "shot while trying to escape." Early last year Dr. Weissler, a Protestant layman who had occupied an important position in the head office of the Confessional Church, was murdered in this same Camp of Sachsenhausen.

Several Germans of high position, and innumerable delegations from all parts of Germany, have interceded for Dr. Niemoller, but in vain.

The National Socialist authorities stipulate that Dr. Niemoller should give an undertaking that for the future he would obey all regulations made by the State. This he refuses to do.

A leaflet circulated privately in Germany among Confessional sympathizers asks:

"What Demands does this Situation make upon Us?

"Firstly, it demands that we should recognize that Pastor Niemoller suffers imprisonment in a concentration camp not only as an individual, but in him the whole Church, and all those who are fighting for the freedom of the Gospel in Germany likewise suffer imprisonment. Secondly, we must never tire in praying for Pastor Niemoller, and for all our brethren in the Church who are persecuted, imprisoned, or otherwise oppressed. It is up to us, wherever we are, not to remain silent, like dumb animals, but to speak out what God has laid upon us, and to struggle for the freedom of His Church, and for the authority of the Gospel in Germany. So long as Pastor Niemoller lies in a camp it constitutes a sign and signal for us, visible from afar, that the Church of Christ in Germany is in bonds. Pastor Niemoller has borne witness to us: 'I believed and therefore did I speak!' Therefore let us also heed that other word: 'Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace.'"

This call has come to followers of Christ inside Germany and also to those outside it. The Church of Christ is one, and we know "whether one member suffereth all the members suffer with it." The fate of Dr. Niemoller is a signal of danger to Christians everywhere. Our suffering fellow-Christians in Germany appeal to us to remember in prayer not only Dr. Niemoller himself, but the cause for which he is suffering.

X.

DID YOU KNOW THIS ?

Dr. Heiler's *Eine Heilige Kirche* has a special number each year dealing with the Churches outside Germany in the previous year. From the 1938 number (*Die Ausserdeutschen Kirchen im Yahre* 1937, Verlag Ernst Reinhardt, München, R.M. 2.80) we pick out a few scraps of information about little known matters, in every case drawn from reports sent by authorities of the respective Church. The whole number is earnestly recommended to those who read German.

1. Polish is now allowed as a liturgical language in the Orthodox Church of Poland.
2. The Holy Synod of Athens has set on foot plans for a scientific edition of the Greek Fathers.
3. " In France the Catholic Church is in a more favourable position than ever . . . anticlericalism is dead . . . the hundredth church built by Cardinal Verdier in the new suburbs of Paris has been completed."
4. The annexation of Austria was treated by the Old Catholics as a deliverance.
5. The Free Churches of Iceland differ from the State Church in organization only, not in doctrine. Their ministers are ordained by the Bishop of Reykiavik.
6. The Church of Estonia is largely Catholic at heart. Saints' Days are observed, the Virgin Mary is honoured. The Church is the cultural centre of the people. It is now out of sympathy with the German Church and closely linked with the Churches of Finland and Sweden.
7. The " creedless " in Latvia, who numbered 9,208 in 1930, fell to 1515 in 1935. The present Government has removed the scandal by which non-believing teachers could give the compulsory religious instruction in the schools.
8. The Waldensian Church in Italy is protected by the State. Its theological students are exempt from military service. Its missionaries are already at work in Ethiopia.
9. A representative gathering of Catholics and Evangelicals has been held in the outskirts of Berlin. The chief feature was common worship. The Evangelicals attended Mass in the Catholic Church. " The pain of exclusion from the Holy Communion must still be borne." The Catholics then went with them to the neighbouring Protestant Church, to join there in corporate worship.

W. K. L. C.

NOTICES

PIERS PLOWMAN AND CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By Greta Hort, Ph.D. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

Piers Plowman has been studied from many points of view, the purely literary and philological, the historical and economic, and as providing a picture of fourteenth-century religion. Dr. Hort attempts a fresh and very promising line of approach. She endeavours to trace in the poem the influences of that mediæval theology with which we may assume Langland to have been, at least to a certain extent, familiar. After a short description of the nature and contents of the poem, the main thesis of this study is stated in Chapter II., namely, that *Piers Plowman* is a theological work cast into the form of a dream-poem. The rest of the book is devoted to the establishment of this position in detail by means of an examination of Langland's views upon such doctrines as those of the nature of man, predestination, the atonement and the sacrament of penance. Dr. Hort compares what he says about these topics with the teaching of representative mediæval theological authorities, and succeeds in shewing considerable parallels. In some cases Langland was actually contributing to the discussion of vexed questions of his day, and, viewed in this light, the whole poem can be seen to be a laboriously elaborated answer to the main question which occupied the poet's mind, the old problem of " What must I do to be saved ?" In short, it would seem that we must regard the poet of Malvern no longer as the Jeremiah of the waning English middle ages, scourging the vices of his day, but rather as a profound, if amateur, theologian expressing himself in the medium of verse. Dr. Hort has made us her debtors by throwing fresh light upon one of the most enigmatical figures of English literature. Her thesis, if accepted, would go far to prove the unity of authorship of *Piers Plowman*, which has been denied.

THOMAS M. PARKER.

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF PERSONALITY. By Grace Stuart. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

In this book of 192 pages Mrs. Stuart deals with some of the theories of modern psychology. She argues that this science in itself is in no position to give complete or adequate guidance of life and needs to be supplemented by some teaching or vision of the Universe as a whole. Psychology reveals needs, needs (as she enumerates them) for love, for significance and for security. What philosophical background can meet these needs ? For this we must move outside strictly psychological limits. Freud, whatever in other respects his limitations may be, emphasizes the need for love, substantially the same as the " Eros " of Plato, to give meaning and purpose to life. Similarly, Adler sees that for a satisfactory life there is the further need of significance; man, that is, must find his place in a community, for " we are members one of another." And, lastly, Jung shews the necessity of courage, to work through to a sense of security. Now all these needs are fundamentally the need for God. Their consideration leads us outside the limits of any departmental

science. Human nature with its empirical shortcomings and its deficiencies takes on a new meaning in the light of a theistic philosophy, and in Christian thought an adequate object of the soul's desire is found in God the Great Lover.

Professor Grensted writes an appreciative preface to this admirable book. W. R. V. BRADE.

CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL: THEN AND NOW. By Arthur E. Henderson. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The Cathedral at Canterbury is something more than a monument to art or even a shrine of worship; and Mr. Henderson has been careful to omit nothing of importance from its history. His book, however, is not a dull conventionality—as one might be led to expect from its not very enterprising title; but the work of one who has put his heart and soul, and something of his mind, into it. "Then" apparently covers the whole of English history, with emphasis upon such cardinal events as changed its architecture or made its name great; and "now," perhaps, a little vaguely, our present heritage of all that is past. Mr. Henderson strikes some light notes when occasion deserves, and the whole book is profusely illustrated. Indeed, the reconstructions of the past by the artist-architect-author are the *raison d'être* of the book.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

HISTORY OF MEDIÆVAL PHILOSOPHY. By Maurice De Wulf. Longmans. 17s. 6d.

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF MARXISM. By Waldemar Gurian. Burns Oates. 7s. 6d.

The gradual return of scholastic philosophy to a place of honour in European thought, since the epochs of Descartes and Kant, has been attended by an ever-growing bibliography; and certain recent exponents of Thomism in this country have been apt to eclipse the work that is being done on the Continent for those who are unacquainted with modern languages. Translations are therefore to be welcomed; and Dr. Ernest Messenger's translation of Professor De Wulf's books would seem to be an admirable piece of work. This, the second volume in a sequence, deals entirely with the thirteenth century. Professor De Wulf does not take for granted the reading of the first volume, but sketches anew the cultural setting of the mediæval scene. He then deals with the principal philosophies of the century—paying particular attention to fresh matter which has come to light in recent researches.

Perhaps the most able part of his book, as it is certainly the most valuable, is his treatment of Duns Scotus; and here a somewhat tired theme receives fresh impetus from this original method of approach. The place of mystical psychology in mediæval thought is a more neglected theme; and Professor De Wulf deals tactfully, perhaps rather than suggestively, with this dangerous theme. His treatment of the opposition to Thomism is also a little on the safe side—at least in the amount of material that it produces; but, as a guide to thirteenth-century thought, the book has a special message for those whose only continental diet on the subject may have been a not too well-digested assimilation of Heiler and Blondel. It closes with a summary of the main philosophical

features of the century whose sum total may justly be said to have constituted an epoch in thought.

As Thomism may certainly be said to have revived during the past decade, so Marxism may be said to be definitely on the wane—at least among those to whom his thought seemed to have come in a burst of surprise immediately after the War. One curious feature, of which Mr. Gurian might have made more, is the fact that where Marxism is on the wane, some form of religion is almost always the gradual substitute; and there are not wanting English thinkers today who have been turning from an idealist Communism to a religion that is becoming every day more and more like Christianity.

The reason for this is not far to seek; and Mr. Gurian, who is a Roman Catholic, certainly sees that the power of Communism lies not in its revolt against capitalism or in the materialistic form which it so often adopts, but in the fact that it is, at base, a religion; and makes upon its adherents demands that only a religion has the right to make. It is true that Mr. Gurian sees Communism in terms of the uglier word Bolshevism—as a wolf in sheep's clothing, and he is not ashamed to play upon the emotional prejudices of his readers; but his book is useful if only because it shows the inevitable doom of a system that has, like Lucifer, attempted to usurp the Throne of the Most High God.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

GOD, MAN AND THE CHURCH: THE SPIRITUAL FOUNDATIONS OF LIFE. By V. Solovyev. Translated by D. Attwater. James Clarke and Co. 5s. net.

An interesting preface by the translator gives some biographical details about the author. Solovyev was originally of the Orthodox Russian Church, but became a Roman Catholic four years before his death. He died in 1900 at the age of forty-seven. Mgr. d'Herbigny, in his book about Solovyev, calls him "a Russian Newman." The translator of the present volume suggests that "a Russian Friedrich von Hügel" would be more appropriate. The principal contents are three Essays on Christianity, the Church and the Christian State.

It appears that the book was originally written in Russian, with the title *The Spiritual Foundations of Life*, then translated into French, and that the English rendering has been translated from the French. It therefore provides an interesting object lesson in higher criticism; at least to those familiar with the three languages, which the present reviewer is not. There are phrases in the English which are lacking in clearness. For instance, the statement that man's personal will "must by his own efforts be overcome, transformed, and reduced to a state of potentiality" (p. 111); or, again, the statement that the God-Word "is a principle which reveals itself outwardly and energizes on the periphery of existence" (p. 118). The author declares, uncompromisingly, that default in hierarchical succession from Christ "deprives the sacraments administered by its clergy of divine grace" (p. 149). On the other there is elsewhere a more cautious statement on the value of Tradition. "We do not accept and revere what Tradition proposes to us because it is traditional—for there can be bad traditions—but because we see in it the work, not of a certain time, place, or person, but of the Holy Spirit who is indivisibly present always and everywhere, and is a witness of what he has done in the Church in times past" (p. 158). The author, moreover,

holds that "Dogmas of divine truth are only enunciated when the representatives of the Church, however few or many, put aside all human views whatsoever and are concerned solely to ascertain the truth of Christ, which is entrusted to the Church by the grace of the Holy Spirit" (p. 164). W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

New Morals for Old. By V. A. Holmes-Gore. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

A restatement and defence of the Christian idea of marriage. Addressed to perplexed Christians. Tersely written and including much in small compass. He holds that the Church has emphasized the negative proposition that divorce is sinful, and would do well to emphasize the positive Christian love and consecrated parenthood. He believes that much of the present attack upon Christian morality is really addressed to traditional and sub-Christian conceptions, and asks us to consider what we really ought to defend. He has given much thought to the question of divorce and that of contraceptives. He insists that the ethics of Jesus Christ were always positive rather than negative, based on love rather than on law, on thinking rather than on tradition. But the thinking must be Christian. In place of scolding, it is our duty to know and to show the more excellent way. H. Lovell Clarke.

Christianity Confronts Communism. By Matthew Spinka, Ph.D. John Gifford, Ltd. 7s. 6d.

The author is master of his subject, and gives succinct documentary evidence for his statements. He presents the Russian Government's attitude to religion, not as arising out of the close alliance of the Russian church with the old régime, but as a fundamental determination to impose a materialistic idealism in place of religion. He writes as a Christian; he portrays the Bolshevist ideals with clearness, Russian Christianity's sufferings with sympathy. He does not so much draw conclusions as state facts. But he leaves two clear impressions: first, that it is world Christianity and religion in general that is being attacked; and, second, that Christianity will win through if it be true to its faith, but that it will need a certain heroic quality, not everywhere apparent at present, if it is to prevail. H. Lovell Clarke.

Creative Revolution. By J. F. T. Prince. George E. Coldwell, Ltd. 6s. 6d.

The author has no sense of any effective Christianity outside the Roman Church. He rightly emphasizes the fact that among present world forces there is to be reckoned individualistic finance, and that it is no part of Christian duty to maintain the present economic system. He sees in Bolshevism a justifiable revolt with a false objective. He views it as a kind of abortive Messianic movement, a Last Judgment upon privilege, the Millennium of the proletariat. He attributes this element, in its character, to frustrated Jews despairing of their religion and their Messiah. He presents Christianity as essentially revolutionary, containing in itself, not only a true, because a spiritual, idealism, but also effective power, if that power be developed, to carry out its bold ideals and to transform world-life. H. Lovell Clarke.

THE ROAD THAT WAS MADE. A STUDY IN REALITY. By L. Firman-Edwards, M.D. James Clarke and Co. 5s.

This book claims to be an attempt at a philosophical study of the nature of reality, and an appeal to intellectual men and women, in an age full of change, to return to "fundamentals," which very definitely include the Catholic Faith. It is confessedly the work of an amateur, and all the better for that! Dr. Firman-Edwards has used his professional skill in another department of knowledge to produce a sound and readable book on his great subject; he charmingly disclaims any deep metaphysical study, and his work is probably stronger historically than philosophically. At any rate, it recognizes the vital contributions to philosophy which must come from history, and above all from the history of Christ and His Church. It does not, like many modern books, gloss over the dogma of our Lord's Virgin Birth, but gives strong reasons for accepting it intellectually. There are useful chapters on the present-day divisions of Christendom, the life after death, the sacraments of the Church, and the problem of evil. Most important of all, the author puts uncompromisingly our Lord's challenge to the modern mind, based on His works, His teaching, and His claims: "There is no middle way; believe Nietzsche or Shelley or Karl Marx, or believe Jesus to be the Christ."

J. H. MCCUBBIN.

GOD, MAN, AND THE UNIVERSE. AN ANSWER TO THE GODLESS. Edited by Ivan Kologriwof, S.J. Coldwell. 6s.

This work is described as "a new *Summa Contra Gentiles*, a compendium of moral, religious, and Christian doctrine against the godless of our day." To compress such a vast body of teaching into 600 pages is a great achievement, and the result is not unduly heavy to read, nor has it suffered much in translation from the French. The teaching of the Church is shewn throughout as being eminently reasonable according to modern intellectual standards. In astronomy, the doctrines of entropy and the expansion of the universe are pressed as arguments in favour of Creation; though the question of finite time does not seem to be considered. The difficult affair of Galileo is explained at some length; it is also pointed out that many great astronomers have been firm believers in God, and some of them priests. Evolution has its limits scientifically, and it is difficult to exclude teleology from it; life has never been produced synthetically, and there is insufficient evidence for the descent of man from monkeys; all this points to the work of a Personal Creator. In dealing with psychology Dr. Ternus states the case against supposing mind to be generated by movements of matter; he quotes from Professor Ladd's *Physiological Psychology*: "The primary and really astonishing fact is that the mind's choice to attend exhausts the cerebral centres by making them do concentrated work. The dependance of the activity of the 'psychomotor' centres upon the purely psychical phenomena of voluntary choice to attend is the most important and marvellous of all psycho-physical facts." In support of the genuineness of Josephus' reference to Christ's resurrection (*Ant.* xviii. 3, 3) Professors Burkitt and Emery Barnes are cited along with Harnack; and an interesting quotation from the most ancient part of the Talmud testifies to His having been crucified "on the *eve* of the Pasch." The historic faults of the Church are not whitewashed, but treated with remarkable frankness. There is

no reference to the Catholic claims of the Anglican communion; an appendix on this would be welcome in a translation for English readers. The development of the Papacy is placed on a par with that of the monarchical episcopate. The Church is no upholder of Capitalism, though she does not fly to the opposite extreme, and can have no dealings with Dialectical Materialism or Leninist Marxism. For the sorrows of the people the Holy Father prescribes not opiates but stimulants!

J. H. McCubbin.

Ancient History of the God Jesus. By Edouard Dujardin. Abridged English Version by A. Brodie Sanders. Watts. 5s.

The author postulates a "prehistoric" mystery religion in Palestine, that of "the god Jesus." Defeated by Judaism, this survived to burst into new life with the "apparition of the god" to Peter while he and the "pre-Christian group of Galileans" were eating the ritual feast at Gilgal. The others also saw the god through "hypnotism by mass-suggestion." Here, as elsewhere, opposing passages (*e.g.*, the appearances to Thomas) are dismissed as "interpolations." This apparition hardly justifies the change of a petty mystery cult into a world-religion. Golgotha is equated with Gilgal, while the name Nun is used to show that Jesus was a fish-god. On M. Dujardin's theory, there was no judicial crucifixion on Golgotha: for Jesus has no historical existence, but only a ritual crucifixion at Gilgal; yet contemporary writers say nothing of the latter. He stresses the similarity between Christianity and the mystery-religions, but fails to shew why the former has alone survived. He contrasts the "disinterested morality" of the first Christian generation with later "sanctions and penalties"; but the sterner aspects of Christianity are emphasized in Paul and Mark as well as in later writers. Christianity has apparently less to fear from gnostic and rationalist attack in the twentieth century than it had in the second.

H. A. Bassett.

Beyond Tragedy. By Reinhold Niebuhr. Nisbet. 8s. 6d.

Protestantism has passed into a new sociological phase, that of Reinhold Niebuhr. It is an appeal to strip from the Christian tradition those elements which have their distinctive roots in philosophies of another ancestry and to return to the New Testament category, a stress upon the apocalyptic activity of God and upon eschatological categories. Dr. Niebuhr has learned much of Karl Barth. He condemns mass-man, and he sees the hope of redemption in Divine activity. The ideals of man, inspired by God and exhibiting an experience of the Divine, must always be more exalted than the ideals which mass-man has formed for social organization. Secular civilizations stand condemned because they are erected upon the power of man. Mankind must struggle for social betterment, but it must realize that the state, which in its forecast seems to be an approximation to the ideal, stands, when achieved, under the judgment of God, for it is erected upon the demonic basis of force. Man is fallen and society is immoral. The Kingdom can only come by the act of God, though it is foreshadowed in all crises of the human spirit.

Such is the philosophy underlying the present volume. Readers will at once notice a condemnation both of a non-worldly mysticism and of

old-fashioned liberalism, "the social Gospel" of a decade ago. Niebuhr meets society with a challenge.

In the present work the author has produced a volume of essays upon the basis of material originally used as sermons. It has a severely practical note, as may be seen in his teaching upon sin and redemption. But he is less than fair to "priestly religion" (*cf.* especially p. 62 *f.*). His teaching is not, of necessity, anti-sacramental, though, like an Old Testament prophet, Niebuhr would always be a challenge to a misused sacramentalism. Yet he stands as a denier of the root-conception of Catholic sacramentalism. It is a real weakness in his thinking. Dr. Temple has named Niebuhr as one of the most significant of living theologians. Just as the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns shewed that Catholicism should comprehend the fundamentals of Barthianism, so Niebuhr awaits a Catholic interpreter who will shew that his teaching upon God, man, and society is essentially that of the primitive Church, a body which certainly did not discount "priestly religion."

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

The Church and Reunion. By Father Vincent McNabb, O.P. Burns, Oates and Washbourne. 6s.

This book consists of a series of articles written at various times. The whole breathes that spirit of charity for which the writer is so well known in Anglican circles. His appreciation of Archbishop Davidson shews an insight and affection which could hardly be surpassed by anyone belonging to the Archbishop's own communion. Of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge he says that it has established a claim to be called the Society for Promoting Christian Charity. Naturally he values the high estimate of St. Peter's position formed by the late Professor C. H. Turner, and the less solid if more sensational gesture made by the Anglo-Catholic Congress in its telegram to the Pope. More controversial are his comments on the Eastern delegation to the Lambeth Conference of 1920, where his pessimistic prophecies have been somewhat falsified by the events of the subsequent ten years. Though he never belittles the claims of Rome, his attitude and sympathy towards those outside her fold make him a worthy apostle of reunion.

H. E. Symonds.

Westminster Abbey, its Worship and Ornaments. By Jocelyn Perkins, M.A., D.C.L., Alcuin Club. Oxford University Press. 25s.

Another book on the Abbey, worthy of its subject and worthy of its sponsors. Dr. Perkins has produced many books lately, but has been working at this since 1921, and as a result there are no signs of haste. Its accuracy is refreshing, the references are full and valuable, and the illustrations and their descriptions are excellent.

In dealing with the pavement and the sedilia the author's enthusiasm is infectious, and his description of Wren's classical altar-piece gives all the facts in handy form. He argues that if this work had been allowed to remain for a few years more no one would have ventured to remove it, but he also pleads for the restoration of the rood above the high altar,

and anyone who has seen its modern counterpart in Wymondham Abbey Church would agree with him that this is more in keeping with the church than Wren's attempt.

In the second part of the book the Sacrist goes fully into the history of the old choir stalls, and has hard words to say about the destruction of the thirteenth-century choir. Here, too, we must all agree, and it is to be hoped that no more attempts will be made to "throw open" the church by destroying the organ screen. We may not deplore the removal of the old choir screens as much as he does, and some of us may think that the difficulties of the "three congregations" have been exaggerated. The *Guardian* seems to have over-emphasized this point in 1848, but it has been overcome in practice, even before the days of loud-speakers.

These criticisms, however, are largely matters of opinion, and Dr. Perkins' readers may judge for themselves.

Superlatives, of praise and even of abuse, abound in the book, and some of the former may well be applied to the author for this labour of love.

Volume II., when it appears, should be just as full of interest and value.

LEIGH H. NIXON.

NICHOLAS FERRAR OF LITTLE GIDDING. By A. L. Maycock. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

The community at Little Gidding is a theme of personal interest to English Churchmen. The tale has been often told, but the present volume is of quite exceptional importance, since the writer had access to an immense series of documents, lately rediscovered, in the library of Magdalene College, Cambridge. Seventy-five letters of Nicholas Ferrar, twelve hundred items concerning the life at Little Gidding—what a treasure for the biographer!

The story of the Virginian Company, and the Ferrars' relation to it, is told at considerable length. It forms a necessary introduction, but the central interest is of course in Little Gidding. The incident about the prominent business man who wanted Nicholas Ferrar to marry his daughter, and proposed to settle £10,000 upon her, is told on page 66, and repeated at greater length on page 94. But Nicholas had resolved on a life of celibacy. The singular secrecy of his ordination by Bishop Laud to the office of deacon is very impressively related.

"Toward evening Nicholas returned home. He immediately sought out his Mother, and found several other members of the family with her. First he told them of his Ordination that morning. Then, drawing from his breast a sheet of vellum, he asked them to listen while he read to them a solemn vow, inscribed and signed with his own hand. It recorded his humble gratitude to God for past blessings, both to himself and to his family. It went on to affirm his resolve to serve God in this holy calling, the office of a Deacon, into which he had that very day been ordained. The spiritual welfare of his own dear family was henceforward to be his chief concern, and he was determined to spend the remainder of his life in mortification, in devotion and charity, and a constant preparation for death. As he finished reading, there was silence for some moments. Then his Mother, shedding tears of joy, tenderly embraced him and most affectionately blessed him; praying that he might have long life, and that he might be filled with the Holy Spirit

daily more and more, to God's greater glory and the good of her and her family."

That is a characteristic example of the spirit in which this Life of Nicholas Ferrar has been written. The biographer is simply steeped in his subject, and exhibits just those qualities which the writing of such a Life requires.

The life at Little Gidding is described with an intimate discriminating knowledge of the separate individual members of the household delightfully represented. The wild rumours concerning their way of life, the falsehoods circulated freely about them, the suspicions to which they were subjected, the spies who visited them, could not but deeply trouble the peace of those within. Nicholas himself once declared that "to fry on a faggot was not a greater martyrdom than continual obloquy." As the biographer says, the little community was subjected to "that kind of unreasoning malice that will twist the simplest statement to its own purposes, and pass on every kind of rumour with the added touch of its own venom." The scurrilous pamphlet on the Arminian Nunnery is fully described.

The book would be even better than it is if the tendency to speculate on possible occurrences had been more restricted, for the real strength of the narrative lies in simple adherence to facts.

To do full justice to this first-rate work would require more space than editorial indulgence can be expected to allow. But enough has been said to shew its exceptional value and its deeply interesting character.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

St. Paul from the Trenches. By G. Warre Cornish. Heffer. 3s. 6d.

This vigorous and beautifully phrased "translation" comes as a welcome voice from the realities of wartime. It can hardly be called a translation, but is more like the paraphrases given by Dr. Armitage Robinson of the thought of Ephesians. It covers 1 and 2 Corinthians and half of Ephesians. The style may be illustrated from the opening words of 1 Cor. xiii.: "I prophesy partially, not fully and perfectly, and so it is with other gifts of the kind, tongues and healing and so on. These are, as it were, but the infancy of the Spirit, its first faint babblings and lispings, but love is full, complete, perfect. Here and now it is the all-inclusive. . . ." The author was killed in 1916. W. K. L. C.

The Catholic Church in Modern Scotland (1560-1937). By Peter F. Anson. Burns and Oates. London.

This book will be of little interest to any save Roman Catholics. The writer tells us that he has endeavoured to be not "unduly partisan," and he certainly exhibits a candour not always found in Roman Catholic writers. Thus he frankly admits that the success of the Scottish Reformation was due to "grave abuses in presenting laymen to benefices, also to the ignorance and low standard of morality among the clergy." He says that the growth of his Church at the present is due to Irish immigration; that in the North and West of Scotland it is difficult to

secure even monthly communion; that "there is no Scottish Cathedral where the Divine Office is publicly recited"; that Scottish Roman Catholics can hardly be persuaded "to take their rightful share in the liturgy"; and that there are few centres where Roman Catholics "have so completely lost the sense of corporate liturgical worship as in Scotland."

The author provides a sketch of the history of his Church from the Reformation to the present day, but the book is for the most part concerned with rather trifling events and with persons of no great importance. The book is well written and documented.

W. Perry.

What Happened at Pentecost, and other papers. By H. J. Wotherspoon, D.D. T. and T. Clark. 5s.

This volume bears the stamp of an original, scholarly and devout mind on every page. Six chapters of the book are concerned with the doctrine and work of the Holy Spirit, two with the doctrine of the Trinity, two more with Universal Priesthood and Worship, and the remaining seven with the Church as an Ethical Society, the use of Sign and Symbol in worship, the Devotional Life; Personal, Common and Sacramental Prayer.

In style and reverence for the truth Dr. Wotherspoon, who was a saint as well as an accomplished scholar, reminds the reader, sometimes of Baron Von Hügel and sometimes of Dr. Moberly; in him as in them the thinking seems to go beyond the words, the spiritual insight to carry on a thought when the mind can go no further.

Here is another sentence from a suggestive essay on Worship: "The Divine quest for worshippers is not incomprehensible. God is love; and love seeks to be known, to be understood; and love seeks response and reciprocity; and love seeks the manifestation of reciprocity."

Those who are acquainted with the author of *Religious Values in the Sacraments* will find in this volume much to stimulate and edify, and those who have missed that (for a Presbyterian) remarkable book should read both.

W. Perry.

A Golden Treasury of Jewish Literature. Selected and Edited by Leo W. Schwarz. Arthur. 10s. 6d.

The Jewish genius for religion is something to which its whole literature, in all ages, bears testimony; and the light of it has penetrated the darkest days of Jewish history. So it is that an anthology of Jewish literature—drama, poetry, and story—is filled with a zest for God and a sense of His Presence. Stefan Zweig, G. B. Stern, Heinrich Heine, Louis Untermeyer, John Cournos, and Israel Zangwill are but a few of the distinguished "moderns" (there are many ancients) to be presented, and there is no lack of dramatic or poetic enterprise. A diffusive miscellaneousness has just been avoided; and the non-Jewish reader will certainly gain from this enterprising volume a glimpse of the most marvellous racial mind that the world has ever known.

Ashley Sampson.

THE DISTINCTIVE ELEMENTS IN CHRISTIANITY. By K. Holl. T. and T. Clark. 2s.

We are grateful to the publishers for giving us this excellent specimen of the famous scholar's essays, at present a sealed book to those who do not know German. The unique thing in Christianity is its message that man has forfeited his worth but that nevertheless God accepts him.

W. K. L. C.

We have received a number of devotional books. *One Sufficient Sacrifice*, Meditations for Good Friday, by Duncan Armytage (Mowbray, 1s. 6d.). *The Fear of the Lord*, by G. D. Carleton, based on Exodus iii.-xv. (Mowbray, 2s. 6d.). *The Treasures of the Heart of Jesus* (Mowbray, 2s. 6d.) is a welcome addition to the Bishop of Nasik's books. A great deal of sound theology is packed into H. C. L. Heywood's *The Worshipping Community* (Faith Press, 1s. 6d.).

W. K. L. C.

ANCIENT HEBREW POEMS. Metrically translated with Introduction and Notes. By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. S.P.C.K. 6s.

These translations represent an attempt to reproduce in English the rhythms of Psalms and other poetical passages of the Old Testament and Apocrypha. Each line of the original poetry contains a definite number of accented syllables, but an indefinite number of unaccented ones; the effect of this, impressive enough in the Hebrew, fails to convince when reproduced in English, a language accustomed from very early times to definite metric schemes derived largely from those of mediæval Latin verse. Dr. Oesterley is quite frank about the difficulties of his enterprise, which was well worth the undertaking, and could scarcely have been better carried out. He surmises that the rhythms derive not from song but from dancing, in which not only the steps but the less regular movements of the arms played their part. Where the unaccented syllables do not fall too irregularly, as in the Fable of the Trees (Judges ix. 8-15), the effect of the translation is remarkably impressive.

J. H. MCCUBBIN.

TAKEN FROM AMONG MEN. By E. D. K. Wood. S.P.C.K. 4s.

There is a freshness about these thoughts on the priestly vocation which we should expect in a book written by a young priest engaged in missionary work. Mr. Wood deals with the inner life of a priest rather than with his outward activities; and this is all to the good, as it is far easier for the younger clergy to get advice on the latter subject than on the former. The book should help its readers—whether young or old—to " stir up the gift that is in them "; and might be used as a help to meditations on the New Testament passages upon which its chapters are based. The writer aims at continuous advance in the priestly life, and this sentence of the book might be taken as its key-note: " One high road to damnation is stagnation."

G. L. MAY.

THE OBEDIENCE OF THE CROSS. By J. O. F. Murray, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s.

In this little book (reminiscent of Moberly's great work) Canon Murray recalls us to the fact that the Offering of Calvary was based upon the love of our Lord for God as well as for man. In these days of slipshod theology and of a tendency to think of the Atonement chiefly as an appeal to the hearts of men, a book which faces frankly the need of a sacrifice for sin is very welcome. To shirk the sacrificial aspect of the Cross, Dr. Murray says (agreeing here with Hicks' *Fullness of Sacrifice*), "is highly unhistorical." The heart of the eternal Father, no less than that of our Lord, was revealed at Calvary. The book has an added value in that its thoughts are based upon Scriptural language (often neglected) about the Atonement. In a useful appendix the author gives a sound criticism of Thornton's *Doctrine of the Atonement* and Sparrow Simpson's *The Redeemer*.

G. L. MAY.

GOD, CREATION, AND REVELATION. By A. J. Macdonald, D.D. The Unicorn Press. 3s. 6d.

This little book consists chiefly of Dr. Macdonald's Boyle Lectures, delivered in 1935 and 1936. It contains a useful summary of the work of scientific writers as to the evidence to be drawn from the natural world for the existence of God. There is a good chapter on the omnipotence of God which is worth pondering. If God is omnipotent, how can the presence of evil be accounted for? Complete knowledge of the processes of evolution is wanting. We cannot tell whether or not these processes are complete, therefore an explanation is bound to be difficult. God's omnipotence cannot mean freedom to create evil. Self-limitation in human beings in the presence of evil is an indication of mastery or potency which in God we describe as omnipotence. "It is the will that surrenders to evil that is not free, for by the passing of evil from temptation to act, freedom and potency have been surrendered." Baron von Hügel always stoutly maintained that the freedom of will in human beings never meant freedom to choose evil. The choice of evil at once indicates an enslaved will. To be perfectly free, to put it in the Baron's way, man must always love and will what is perfectly good.

Dr. Macdonald maintains that while the Virgin-birth of our Blessed Lord makes, perhaps, the greatest demand upon the reason of modern man, yet the surrender of our belief in that doctrine makes faith more difficult, for we weaken the evidence of the Resurrection for the Divine claims of Christ. This, indeed, has been done by extreme Liberal and Modernist theology. The physical Resurrection of Jesus has been abandoned by Liberals and Modernists, and with considerable justification if the human origin of Jesus was that of any other man. When Dr. Macdonald passes to the consideration of Christian ethics he is on less certain ground. He thinks the teaching of Jesus as it related to human life may need modification and adjustment to meet modern conditions, and he imagines our Lord "almost certainly" as saying to us today, with reference to the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, "Ye have heard what I said then, but now I say unto you——" Conservatism in theology and liberalism in ethics, a strange combination! And liberalism of such a kind as to degenerate swiftly into licence.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

ST. PAUL. By Arthur Darby Nock. Thornton and Butterworth. Home University Library. 2s. 6d.

Professor Nock has achieved a real triumph. I know from experience how hard it is to write a short life of St. Paul, and the difficulties are admirably set out in the introduction. St. Paul before his conversion was a partly Hellenized Jew, one of a large class of men who stood somewhere between the rabbinical Judaism established by Ezra and his successors and the vague philosophical monotheism which was fairly common in the Gentile world. He was transformed by an overpowering spiritual experience into a follower of Jesus; but Jesus for him was far more a glorified Lord than a Master who had risen from the dead. His letters reveal his contacts with mainly Gentile converts on the one hand and more orthodox Jewish Christians on the other; they expound his faith in relation to various problems of his pastoral work, some of which we can only reconstruct with a large measure of conjecture. His life has also been recorded by an admirer, the author of Acts, in a book which sometimes seems excellent history and sometimes quite out of touch with the facts of the Epistles.

Professor Nock has succeeded to admiration in conveying the general atmosphere of Judaism and Hellenistic religion and of the *tertium quid* of Hellenistic religion; he is no less successful in his interpretation of St. Paul's letters, as the expression of his own intense personal love for the Lord and for his converts, and in tracing the general lines of his religious and theological development. It is rare to find such a combination of objective understanding and sympathetic insight in this field. I am inclined to think that he underrates the historical value of Acts (I remain an impenitent "South Galatian"); but he manages, in the short space available, to indicate the main issues on which critics are divided. He has a quite brilliant explanation of the circumcision of Titus—namely, that Titus himself agreed to undergo circumcision for the sake of peace without St. Paul's consent.

I can only express the hope that all those who are responsible for teaching the Scriptures, but have no time for a detailed study of theology, will read and master this book. Those who are just starting on the study of theology could find no better introduction; those who are professional theologians will find much to learn from it. It remains to add that the style is a masterpiece of simplicity; there is not a line that is dull or a line that is unintelligible.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

THE FIRST FIVE CENTURIES OF THE CHURCH. By James Moffatt. University of London Press. Hodder and Stoughton. 6s.

To compress the first five centuries of Church history into 205 pages of large print is a heroic task. Dr. Moffatt has done for Church History what Pelham did for Roman, and done it well. It is easy to criticize such a work for a certain lack of proportion. Doctrinal matters are treated very shortly, and it seems hardly necessary to write "Olympic games held for the last time in 393," and on the same page, "Augustine writes on Genesis, Galatians, and Sermon on the Mount (by 394); then his 'Confessions' (398) in the third year of his episcopate at Hippo." The principal value of the book is that it gives (which Church histories fail, as a rule, to do) a brief outline of the Roman empire. Church

history cannot be understood without an appreciation of the "powers that be" of the period. Pp. 206-251 are an excellent bibliography. The book will be very useful to a student who has read two or three Church histories and wants to find in brief outline the political and imperial background. R. S. T. HASLEHURST.

BOOK NOTES

A Little Dictionary of Bible Phrases. By W. K. Lowther Clarke. S.P.C.K. 1s. Bishop Blunt is editing a series of Biblical handbooks, and the first to appear in it is Dr. Lowther Clarke's little dictionary of Bible phrases. From Abba to Zealot the author pursues his way through the 89 pages packed with matter. We feel no hesitation in saying that if our clergy and Sunday School teachers possessed such a clear and cheap book they would revolutionize what is actually taught. It is needless to say that the dictionary is scholarly, for Dr. Lowther Clarke's name means scholarship. It is also so clear that there is no mistaking his meaning in any of the entries we have consulted.

Is not this the Son of Joseph? By T. Walker. J. Clarke. 3s. 6d. The sub-title of this book states that it is an exposition of the relevant chapters of the Gospels in the light of Jewish culture, and in this light this book is to be read throughout. Its leading conception is the Virgin Birth stories, and the Author believes that in the original form of the Gospels these stories set down legitimate birth, not necessarily virgin birth. Perhaps the outstanding chapter is the first, concerning the Semitic mysticism of the Conception stories, and it is here the author breaks original ground. His conclusion is: "Among people of Hebrew training the story of the conception of Jesus would not suggest an exception to the usual rule of entrance into human life any more than would the companion story of John. With such obviously Hebrew pre-suppositions as are revealed in the story, the writer could never have intended it to have done so." R. H. M.

Challenge, by M. R. Bennett (Longmans. 3s. 6d.), is breathless and, in spite of the Archbishop of York's commendation, cannot be taken seriously. "Christianity . . . is getting milk to schools, it is organizing industry for the good of all," is a typical dictum.

The Way of Victory. By Father Andrew. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. Another book by Fr. Andrew needs no recommendation. Readers know what to expect, and will find it. W. K. L. C.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher